

FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIAL HYGIENE

ISSUED BY
THE BRITISH SOCIAL HYGIENE
COUNCIL, Inc.

Contributors .

CYRIL BURT.	B. MALINOWSKI.
WINIFRED CULLIS.	ARTHUR NEWSHOLME.
JULIAN S. HUXLEY.	T. PERCY NUNN.
J. ARTHUR THOMSON.	

LONDON
THE BRITISH SOCIAL HYGIENE COUNCIL, Inc.
CARTERET HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1.

1926

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I.—SOCIAL HYGIENE. J. Arthur Thomson, M.A., LL.D. ...	5
II.—SOCIAL HYGIENE. THE BIOLOGICAL APPROACH. Julian S Huxley, M.A.	14
III.—THE CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY TO SOCIAL HYGIENE. Cyril Burt, M.A., D.Sc.	26
IV.—ADDRESS ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIAL HYGIENE. B. Malinowski, Ph D, D Sc.	54
V.—THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION AND TRADITION IN SOCIAL HYGIENE. T. Percy Nunn, M.A., D Sc.	85
VI.—THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME IN SOCIAL HYGIENE. Winifred Cullis, O B E., D.Sc	92
VII.—THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL HYGIENE Sir Arthur Newsholme, K C.B., M.D.	107
VIII.—STATEMENT OF CONTINENCE IN RELATION TO SOCIAL HYGIENE. Prepared by the British Social Hygiene Council	129
IX.—List of Members of the Social Hygiene Committee of the British Social Hygiene Council	143

PREFACE

IF Venereal Diseases are to be stamped out their dual character must be recognised. They are in themselves diseases which can be opposed by medical means, but they are more: they are a symptom of social disorder which cannot be cured by drugs or appliances.

If the Venereal Diseases are to be stamped out every agent and agency that can be mobilised against them must be brought into action, and of these none can be more certainly helpful than increased knowledge and understanding.

The lectures which are printed in this book contain much knowledge and are infused with understanding. All who are concerned to see a more healthful world must be grateful to the members of the Social Hygiene Committee who did the spade work and made the course possible, and to the band of distinguished men and women of science who have so generously given their time and knowledge to prepare and deliver the lectures.

A. GEDDES.

SOCIAL HYGIENE.

By J. ARTHUR THOMSON, M.A , LL.D.

Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen University.

1. AN Impressionist biological survey of our communities seems to forbid pessimism in regard to health. Children at play, men at work in the open air, the members of a golf club, a morning train emptying at a city terminus, the crews of the trawlers when they come into port, the jollity of a country fair—in a hundred directions we find evidence of a strong current of healthfulness in our midst. There is no warrant for an alarmist position. Yet if we take a friendly doctor with us on our survey, we soon discover that things are not quite so satisfactory as they seem; and when we correct our impressions with vital statistics, we lose all complacency. There is much disease in our midst—overflowing hospitals and asylums and overworked panel doctors; there is much venereal disease, though there is recent alleviation and though its incidence varies greatly in different towns; there is much depressed vitality and dispiritedness, sex-mischief and sex-disharmony, there are still many forms of work that are to a considerable extent unwholesome, there are many houses that only the miracle of love can make homes.

2. In face of these evils there are many who ask. Who will show us any good? And it is well at the outset to recognise that there are many answers, each with its contribution. Some would say, for instance, that what we most need is a new heart; social renewal requires religious revival. Others would say that what is most required is a change in our social organisation, for we are enmeshed in a net handed down from the early industrial age—a net in which we struggle without getting free from its entanglement. Thus our best efforts are often baulked. Besides these two answers there are others, most of them of value, but our particular concern here is with the help that *science* can give.

Although man's appeal to medical knowledge is in a measure an appeal to science, taking us back to antiquity, the wider idea

of the control of life by science is modern. Bacon had it, of course, as when he spoke of science as "a rich storehouse for the glory of the Creator, and for the relief of man's estate," or when, in reference to Solomon's house, he said: "The end of our foundation is the knowledge of causes and the secret motions of things, to the enlargement of the bounds of human empire and the effecting of all things possible" But great progress towards mastery has been made since Bacon's day, and it is with justified hopefulness that we invoke the aid of science to help us amid our sea of troubles. Science is for life, Herbert Spencer said, not life for science. The days of folded hands and fatalism are over; science is always *meliorist*, its watchword is "Face the facts; try to understand them, control will follow" Thus in regard to health and social hygiene, we ask: What can Science do?

3. What can Science do for "the relief of man's estate"? But our question should rather be "What can science *not* do?" Let us think vividly for a moment of some modern achievements. Science has brought the stars near and weighed some of them in a balance, has knocked a piece out of an atom; has mastered some of the many octaves on the long gamut of electro-magnetic radiations, using those at one end for broadcasting and those at the other end for radio-therapy. Utilising Becquerel's great discovery of radio-activity, science can detect the bullet buried in the bone or the pearl hidden in the unopened oyster, it is beginning to see the invisible even from a great distance. By means of powerful electric discharges, man is now able to tap the inexhaustible supply of nitrogen in the atmosphere, and use it for the synthesis of fertilisers—which means making bread out of the thin air.

And if it be said that these illustrations of scientific achievement are in the physical world, whereas our troubles are in the world of life, we have only to recall some of the many victories that are to the credit of modern medicine with Biology at its back. One of the heaviest mundane clouds that has ever rested on the human race is Ankylostomiasis—a wasting disease of warm countries, due to a contemptible little threadworm that finds entrance into man through the skin of his bare feet. But this "hookworm" has been practically conquered, it is easily expelled from the human body, and re-infection can be prevented—if man is willing—by simple sanitary precautions. Thus the

cloud of "tropical depression", implying debility, despair and dreary death, is being lifted. Already in some places the incidence of hookworm disease has been reduced from about 25 per cent. to about 3 per cent. What can Science *not* do?

Of the 30,000 or so children born every year in Cairo, 10,000 are said to be attacked by the painful and weakening disease of Bilharziasis, due to a fluke-worm, whose minute larva enters the body from the water in which the children paddle. During the Great War, when this parasitic worm (*Schistosomum*) was very troublesome to our soldiers in Egypt, Major Leiper unravelled its complicated life-history, and found its young stages in water-snails. More than that, he showed that if the water, in which the minute free-swimming larvæ swarm, is left still in cisterns and the like, the larvæ die off, so that the water is no longer infective. Bilharzia is theoretically conquered.

A cretinoid child, arrested in the development of its body and mind, is one of the saddest of sights. Its thyroid gland is not functioning properly, and progress has stopped. But it is one of the triumphs of modern medicine that the child can be released from the spell if it is treated with thyroid material from sheep or calf. Similarly, there is the insulin treatment of diabetes, and, on another line, the serum-treatment of diphtheria. Ankylostomiasis, Bilharziasis, Cretinism, Diabetes . . . so we might continue down the alphabet of medical triumphs! But we shall mention only one other advance, that the child born in 1926 has a life-expectancy twelve years greater than that of a child born a hundred years ago; and almost the whole of the improvement—unfortunately not continuing at the same level—was effected in little more than a generation. Our point is simply that when biological and medical science turns with all its strength from the completed conquest of disease to the attainment of positive health, we may reasonably expect an insurgent progress.

4. At present, however, the biologist cannot but be impressed with the painful contrast, as regards health, between civilised society and Wild Nature with which man has not interfered. In civilised society disease is rife—environmental, functional, microbic and constitutional—meaning by disease a deteriorative and disintegrative disturbance of vital processes. But in Wild Nature disease is all but unknown. Apparent exceptions to this statement leap to the mind—grouse disease, salmon disease, potato disease,

larch disease, and so on ; but most if not all of these apparent exceptions may be associated with man's interference. By over-sheltering, over-exposure, over-crowding, contamination, or some other interference, man alters the natural régime which always makes for health. In Wild Nature pathological variations tend to be nipped in the bud ; there is persistent elimination of the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin, healthfulness is demanded in the struggle for existence. But in civilised society there is endless compromise with the abnormal. Man's ambitions and desires are often so strong that health becomes a secondary consideration ; social sentiment being strong there is necessarily much cobbling and coddling, kind in the present, cruel to the future ; man has a dull health conscience and weak resting "instincts." Just as an ant society may shelter individuals who cannot forage for themselves, nor even eat the food that is brought to them, so human society shelters undesirable individuals, who would be speedily eliminated in non-social conditions. It is not so much the shelter of undesirables that one deplores—costly as it is ; what is alarming is the permission or encouragement to multiply.

Another feature in the contrast is that civilised society is blotched with depressed vitality or "sub-health," whereas Wild Nature is for the most part a world of exuberant vigour. There are, indeed, easy-going, sluggish and parasitic animals, but the rule is a high standard of health. Similarly, it is only in mankind and in the creatures he shelters that we find senility—deterioration that disintegrates the unity of the organism, the nemesis of over-cobbling, over-coddling, and physiological bad debts. In Wild Nature there is never more than senescence. There is ageing, indeed, but no senility, for the creature that grows old is pushed off the stage by some competitive blow or environmental gust, before any marked deterioration has set in. No doubt from hour to hour we must "ripe and ripe," but it should not be beyond man's power to evade "rotting and rotting."

Sadly prominent in civilised society is the pathology of sex ; in Wild Nature it is conspicuous by its rarity. There are some over-sexed animals and ugly erotic orgasms, but they are exceptional. In many cases, as among birds, there is singularly beautiful courtship and the conjugal relations are pleasant to contemplate. There are many loyally monogamous animals. But in civilised

society the pathology of sex is obtrusive the long-continued disgrace of prostitution, the prevalence of venereal diseases; the frequency of sensuality and degenerative sex-habits; the common occurrence of nominal celibacy, the postponement of marriage owing to economic, housing, and other difficulties; and in some countries, like ours, the large number of unmarried women—a disproportion that always lowers the standard of sex-selection on the woman's part. Why should there be so much pathology of sex in civilised society? Part of the answer is, no doubt, as in the contrasts already noted, that man's evolution has been in process for a relatively short time compared with the unthinkable millions of years during which disharmonies have been sifted out from Wild Nature. Furthermore, as regards sex, it must be admitted that civilised man is not seasonally punctuated as most animals are, and that animals are not in the same degree subject to the social and ethical limitations which lead in man to ignoble repressions in default of ennobling control. But there is another factor to be recognised, that sex-selection (sifting for mates) among animals has very frequently reference to vigour, agility, artistic gifts, and the like—all spelling health. This has been true in mankind also, as Darwin insisted, but one has only to look around to see that considerations of health do not always count for much in human marriages.

From man one would expect great things as regards health, for he stands apart from the beasts of the field in his language, in his power of conceptual inference (reason), in his consciousness of his own history, and in his capacity for controlling his conduct in reference to ideals. Yet our contrast has shown that as regards healthfulness man is still muddling along!

5. If one were asked to formulate the largest idea that Biology has to contribute to the theory of social reform, including social hygiene, one would say this: that integrative human evolution must proceed along three lines, if it is to be stable. The three lines are the sides of the "biological prism"—Organism, Function, Environment, or, in human terms, Folk, Work, Place.

The improvement of the breed is fundamental. You cannot gather grapes off thorns, or figs off thistles. Yet what is inherited must be functioned with, if it is to be realised. The hereditary endowment cannot be increased as regards the number of different talents, but the talents can be traded

with. And who shall set limits to the value of environmental nurture? The good seed requires good soil. The buds of our inheritance, as Walt Whitman said, are "to be opened on the old terms." If the wan blind Proteus of the Dalmatian Caves is taken young enough, it may become pigmented under appropriate illumination, and may actually develop a seeing eye. Many social reforms fail of their full fruition because it is not realised that Organism, Function, and Environment (Folk, Work, and Place) must evolve together if progress is to be sure.

6. Towards an improvement in the positive health of the nation many factors are contributing: (a) Sanitary and hygienic advances, the efforts of Health Committees and Medical Officers of Health, and the development of Preventive Medicine must be gratefully recognised (b) Many teachers, clergymen, and family doctors are helping nobly towards a higher ambition of personal health and moral control (c) Every man and woman of good will is furthering some one or other of the many movements that directly or indirectly make for health—boy scouts, girl guides, open-air clubs, gardening, sports, hobbies for leisure time, "Mothers and Babies," women citizen associations, guilds, temperance societies, and many more, so diverse in their nature that there is always one or another that appeals to us.

But we venture to submit some personal suggestions that appeal particularly to ourselves. (1) No one can exaggerate the value of health. It is half-way to happiness, it unifies our whole being (which disease distracts and disrupts); it tends to be associated with healthy-mindedness; it helps us to rebel against ignoble acquiescences; it is a sensitive touchstone of moral conduct; and its economic value is inestimable. It is said that three million working days are lost in Great Britain every year from rheumatism alone. Health has survival value, for individual and for nation alike.

Now, if health is of this high value, it would probably reward the Ministry of Health to discover and ordain twelve apostles of health, who would be sent throughout the country as missionaries. We mean men and women of irradiating healthfulness, who by their daily walk and conversation, as well as by their well-informed precept, would make people feel that health—positive health—is one of the most desirable things in the world, one of the saving graces of life.

(2) The indirect is often more potent than the direct, and beautifying societies would work wonders towards healthfulness. Ugly rooms, ugly houses (so terribly multiplied of late), ugly streets, ugly towns, work against health. It is easier to live a healthy life in a home than in a hovel. Beauty is a tonic towards health.

(3) It is a difficult doctrine to live up to, but the socialised and moralised criticism of expenditure is one of the most powerful levers of human progress. Where one has any alternative in spending money, one should spend in the direction of occupations and products that make for health. A gift of flowers is biologically better than a turned ivory ornament, and a little picture is psychologically and socially better than a platinum ring.

(4) There is no blinking the fact that our communities are being weakened by lack of selection for health. Man has rebelled against the crude and cruel winnowing of Nature's régime, but he has not succeeded in replacing it by a sufficiently resolute and thought-out rational and social selection. This is "the dilemma of civilisation." As Herbert Spencer said, "Any arrangements which, in any considerable degree, prevent superiority from profiting by the rewards of superiority, or shield inferiority from the evils it entails, any arrangements that make it as well to be inferior as to be superior, are arrangements diametrically opposed to the progress of organisation and the reaching of a higher life."

(5) It may seem to some a little thing, but great results would probably follow a more generous social recognition of the pre-eminently healthy. It should not be beyond man's wit to devise something corresponding to an Order of Merit for health. Just as the school-child, never absent for five years, is sometimes socially honoured in the newspapers, so it might be in subtler ways for workmen never absent from work during working days.

(6) It is impossible to discuss here the difficult problems of birth control, segregation and sterilisation, and opinions differ as to whether we are ready for marriage-certificates and parentage-permits, but there are lines of practicable eugenics in regard to which all must be agreed, that, for instance, it is never justifiable to spoil good seed by mixing it with bad.

(7) It seems to many a hazardous inactivity in modern times to allow young people to grow up without more definite instruction in the laws of health and happiness. These physiological and psychological laws must, of course, include the facts of sex, though these should never be isolated from the problem of the all-round healthfulness of the organism. Never was there more need for biological teaching in schools, including not only timely and thorough physiology, but a familiarity with such ideas as growing, developing, habit-forming, varying—for we are living in a mechanical age. If our hereditary buds are to be opened aright, we must secure “the old terms,” which include first-hand impressions of *life*.

In conclusion, the biologist is in the fortunate position of studying a central science. There is a legitimate field for the chemistry and physics of living creatures, so he must appreciate *these*. There is also a psychology of many animals and a sociology of a few, so he must appreciate *these*. And then there is Biology itself. Therefore, the biologist has least excuse for partial views, because, perforce, he must take so many. His final word must therefore be. Let us try to take an all-round view.

The inclination of many is to plead for wealth, the mastery of natural energies, their economical use and transformation. The great chemist, Sir William Ramsay, once declared that “real progress consists in learning how better to employ energy—how better to effect its transformation.” This is profoundly true, and yet very limited. What is wealth without health? No doubt, the curse of the poor is their poverty, but the biological ideals rise beyond the transformation of energy to vigour, initiative, adaptation to stimulating and enriching surroundings—health, for short.

But the same sort of mistake will be made if we lay all the stress on the healthy body. For what will it avail if the body is fair and the mind foul. We must complete the trilogy—wealthy, healthy, and wise. We hear about balance of bodily food, but what of the nurture of the mind? Just as there may be Calcium starvation, so there may be Beauty starvation. We must look to it that we do not shut ourselves off from the ultra-violet rays of the spirit.

But even wealthy plus healthy plus wise is incomplete, for we are social organisms in our very essence, citizens of no mean

city, members of the body politic, members of one another, folk working together in a given place. Thus, social considerations must be supreme, over the ideals of "wealthy, healthy and wise"

We cannot conclude, however, without a reference to ants, bees and wasps, which offer a lurid warning to the social reformer. Some people are fond of speaking of "the human herd," and others play with the phrase "the human hive." Both terms are fallacious, but they may be of service in reminding us that we may pay too dear for our socialising. Let us go to the bee, for instance, upheld as an embodiment of all the virtues except hospitality. Bees are wonderful creatures, the finest children of instinct in the world, and the social organisation of the hive is marvellous. But is it admirable? When we look into the matter more critically, what a very seamy side is disclosed. There is the establishment of a reproductive, non-productive caste—a loathsome idea, there is the dependence of the whole system on a huge proletariat of suppressed females, instinctively servile and largely unintelligent, there is the terrible thirling of the queen to her exaggerated maternity, and as a bitter bathos, there is the massacre of the drones. Heaven help us from going to the bees.

But the generalised moral is this, that social organisation is not necessarily a good thing in itself. It requires to be scrutinised not only in terms of wealth and health, both so conspicuous in the bee-hive, but in terms of the higher values—the good, the beautiful, and the true, with their outcome in the evolution of man's personality. "For what profit will there be if a man gains the whole world and forfeits his soul?"

SOCIAL HYGIENE. THE BIOLOGICAL APPROACH.

By JULIAN S. HUXLEY, M.A.

Professor of Zoology, King's College, University of London.

(*Reprinted from "The Nineteenth Century."*)

THOUGH the term social hygiene is new many of the ideas which underlie it are old enough. The term implies, I take it, a concern with the health of society as an organism—if I may be permitted to use the word organism in a somewhat vague sense, without committing myself or my readers to any purely organismic theory of society such as that held by Herbert Spencer. Society does resemble an organism in being self-perpetuating, in being composed of self-reproducing units, and in being held together in an organic way.

Social hygiene concerns itself chiefly with the biological foundations of society, with the quality of the population, with its changes from generation to generation, with the social effects of disease, and in especial with those racial aspects of the social problem which are almost invariably neglected alike by the economist, the medical man, the social reformer and the statesman. Plato in the *Republic* tackled the questions of social hygiene; so have most writers of Utopias. But to-day social hygiene is no longer Utopian. We may not be able to see very far in advance, but we can see clearly, we can point to immediate and practical application, and we can link our ideas on this subject on to a broad basis of facts and ideas in other spheres. This has come about through the rise of scientific knowledge in general, and biological knowledge in particular. It is a part of the new humanism which is arising out of scientific advance.

It is the claim of the biologist that some knowledge of the simple facts of biology should be an essential part of the equipment of every educated man; elementary biology should be as much a part of the common mental stock-in-trade of a country as to-day are writing or arithmetic. And it is my business here to point out some of the ways in which, through biology, the aim of social hygiene may be furthered.

Biology is not a difficult subject to teach, for a great part of the necessary material of demonstration lies in our own human bodies, and much else, in the shape of familiar plants and animals, is at our doors. Not only that, but almost every child has naturally a deep interest in the workings of its own organism, and the great majority at some time or another pass through a phase of interest in nature.

Nor is the arrangement of the teaching in the subject one on which there should be much difference of opinion. It can be begun with what is usually called nature-study until the external forms and something of the life-histories of common plants and animals are known.

From this level, at the age of ten to twelve, further advance can be made. The human body can be taken as chief object of study, and its various functions gone through one by one, till the child is familiar with the outline at least of its wonderful machinery. Meanwhile, other lines can be pursued. The details of life's chemistry can be studied by the aid of quite simple experiments on plants, and so the more complex chemical physiology of men and the higher animals, which is not capable of practical demonstration in schools, made more real. Then the life-histories of a number of animal and plant types can be studied in detail. This will give the opportunity for a biological understanding of what reproduction means, in the protozoan type or in *Hydra* the child will see reproduction for what it essentially is—continued growth followed by separation of one part from the other. And sex will slip into its proper place in the scheme of things.

If the school can boast a microscope a whole new world of interest and wonder can be brought within the grasp of the boys and girls, and they can profitably spend much of their biological time simply in the absorption and realisation of some of the thousands of new facts and things and existences which, through the microscope's mechanical eye, are revealed to them in this new world.

Just as sex finds its proper level when introduced as part of a biological course, so does hygiene. Hygiene alone can be a dreary performance. A French boy of my acquaintance tells me how in his *lycée* the class had to learn and recite by heart large chunks of a text-book on hygiene—with peculiar appropriateness when

the subject was the value of fresh air, the class large, and all windows tightly shut ! That is an extreme case. But hygiene is only applied biology, and without biology in general and physiology in particular it is as uninspiring as all other applied sciences when studied in themselves, apart from the general principles of their parents the pure sciences

Starting from the "Web of Life" as seen in nature around them, the children's attention can be directed to parasites, their biological meaning, and their practical importance. Building on these foundations, we can point the human moral by stories of Pasteur and Lister, of Manson and Ross, of Gorgas and the Panama Canal, of the meaning of the campaign against Yellow Fever, Malaria, Hookworm and Sleeping Sickness. Each story is a romance, but each romance had its basis in hard-won new knowledge. The value of sanitation, light, exercise, can all be emphasized in the same way, beginning from pure biology.

Finally, there is the collecting instinct to harness. A school-master or schoolmistress who is anything of a naturalist, or indeed anything of a nature-lover, can do a great deal with this driving force. School collections of flowers, mosses, insects, fossils, flint implements and many other objects can be amassed and added to year by year. The class can make, not collections only, but can start a survey of the country round. Geography, geology, agriculture and natural history here all join hands, nor need history be left out of the band. Such "regional surveys," with map to be completed as tangible goal before them, with the healthy rivalry of successive classes, year by year, each aiming to outdo the one before in helping on the work, with their focussing on a near-at-hand problem, followed by discovering that this links up with every imaginable theory and general principle—such surveys are among the finest instruments of true education that exist. It is, alas, true that in large towns they are impossible or far more difficult. In towns, however, there is the partial compensation of a museum, and by visits to this, aided by occasional excursions, the same sort of end may be attained.

On the purely biological side, the ecological point of view should be stressed—the strictly-balanced interplay of each organism with its neighbours and with its lifeless surroundings. Plant and animal parasites, partnership between two separate organisms, as in the lichen or the orchid or the hydra; the differences between

the plant communities of down, field, fen, pond, stream and woodland, and their whys and wherefores, the same, so far as possible, for animals, the cyclical recurrence of summer droughts and hard winters, and their effects on the plant and animal population of the country; the "food-chains" stretching up and out from grass and other green plants through various strange transformations, some passing up to man, others short-circuited through humble scavengers, all reverting at the last to grass and green plants once more.

At the age of 15 or 16 the child is growing up. If it is ever to have any interest in general principles, now is the time to rouse that interest. Perhaps the greatest general principle which can now be put before the growing mind is that of evolution. After its previous acquaintance with the variety of living and past organisms, it will slip into the evolutionary idea as readily as a duckling into the water, and will float upon it as easily too. Direct observation can now be more and more supplemented by books; and evolutionary progress, culminating in the evolution of man himself, can be firmly established as a vital fact.

Next there are the principles of heredity. The laws of Mendel are simple enough in their arithmetic, but involve thinking in a new way of the relation between parent and offspring. Once the ideas of constancy of hereditary units or factors, and of their recurrent shuffling and recombination in each generation have been grasped, human variety takes on a new interest. The effects of mutation and of selection can also be illustrated from domestic animals and cultivated plants.

Some further knowledge of immunity and bacteriology may now easily be given, and this leads on to further studies in hygiene along the lines of Public Health and Preventive Medicine.

If possible, the development of some higher animal, like frog or chick, should be studied, and the amazing facts and generalisations of embryology brought before the mind.

Various specialisms can be introduced according to taste—that must be the affair of the particular teacher: but in general the aim should be to take the simple facts which had been studied in the earlier periods, and give them new meaning by illuminating them with the light of general ideas and principles.

Finally, there is one much neglected branch of scientific education—the history of science. If this is intelligently taught,

it has the greatest value. As part of a general history of thought and civilization, it opens the eyes of the growing boy or girl to the slow but steady progress of human mind in its dealings with the surrounding universe, shows the value of scientific curiosity, of abstract thought and of apparently useless researches. Meanwhile on the purely scientific side, it illuminatingly warns against dogmatism. By pointing to the abundant scientific theories of the past which to-day seem ludicrous, or fantastic, such as the Ptolemaic astronomy, or the views of the early anatomists on the course of the blood, or the phlogiston theory, it reminds us that many of the current theories of the science of our own day are doubtless destined to be relegated to the same limbo among similar curiosities of human thought.

Some of my readers will perhaps ask what all this detail of possible educational methods in biology has to do with social hygiene. But the answer is simple and clear enough. If once such teaching were introduced and efficiently carried through, it would in itself constitute the best possible biological approach to social hygiene that could be imagined. For now let us think what are the biological prerequisites or foundations for an enlightened public opinion on social hygiene.

First and foremost among these is the idea of man as an organism. Man is a unique organism. He differs in various extremely important and indeed fundamental ways from all other organisms; but organism he is. His fundamental differences from other animals are manifold: he has at his command new biological methods, such as the new form of inheritance we call tradition, and the new tool which consists in the making of tools; and he lives according to a scale of values many of which are new, quite different from the values implicit in the lives and actions of lower animals. That is to say, clearly, that much of his life, and that the most important part, can never be interpreted on the principles of pure biology. On the other hand, the *bases* of his life are all biological—his organs and their functions, his instincts, his diseases, his senescence and death, his reproduction and the methods of his physical heredity. Only his brain and mind have achieved radically new departures. To put it in briefest fashion, pure biology alone is not sufficient for the science of man; but the science of man without biology is unintelligible, a building without foundation.

Next is the concept of evolution. This in a sense is but an extension of what we have been saying, but it is a very important extension, and opens many new windows. We find that change is the order of things among organisms; that the two immediate results of change are either better adaptation, or extinction; and that when we look at life as a whole, and not merely at particular species, there is a broad trend of change that we must call progress—an average change in a direction which to our ideas implies increasing value. What's more, through the genius of Darwin, we are enabled to see in general *how* all the changes can be explained on natural principles, and do not require the intervention of an external creator or a guiding "vital force" or similar power. Variation, heredity, and the struggle for existence, as consequence, natural selection, and as further consequence, extinction of some types, special adaptations of others, and general progress in regard to the highest level of organization—there we have the links in the causal chain.

Man himself is seen to be only intelligible in terms of his past. His past will not (in the present state or any likely future state of our knowledge) explain all of him, but his present is inexplicable without a knowledge of his past.

In the larger vista provided by evolution, historic events dwindle to small irregularities on a general curve, and historic time shrinks in length when its centuries are confronted with the ten-thousand and hundred-thousand-year periods by which organic evolution must be measured. We see further that there is no reason why human evolution should not advance further in the future. It is still obviously and rapidly going on as regards our tools and machines and methods of organization; this very advance in tradition (to use the most general term) has prevented there being any great pressure of natural selection upon the human type itself. But now that we see that progressive evolution has occurred in the past, and may be continued into the future, by that very vision we are become responsible for its continuance and proper guidance in our own race.

It is at this point that the definitely eugenic point of view enters. Eugenics is the step-child of politics. It deals only in long views and fares badly in consequence, just as afforestation has fared badly for the same reason. So far as social hygiene is concerned, politics deal only with improve-

ments in the conditions of living—with housing, wages, education, sanitation, hours of labour and the like. It deals only with each generation as it comes along. Any serious attempt to understand the relation of one generation to the next is still beyond it.

What is above all wanted is an informed public opinion on the subject. How many people have really grasped the idea that “the race” (using that much abused word in its incorrect but ordinary sense) has a material basis, consisting of the sum total of hereditary factors handed down from generation to generation, that these factors may have good, bad, or indifferent effects, and that accordingly the innate potentialities of the race depend upon the relative proportions of good, bad and indifferent factors in the whole population; that these proportions may alter through the greater fertility of some strains or the dying out of others, and that therefore the inborn character of the race may change from generation to generation?

How many realize that there might well exist an improvement in individual health going hand in hand with deterioration of racial health? Each individual person might come much nearer than before to realizing the physical and mental possibilities that were in him, might run less risk of early death from disease; might, through education and other social agencies, come to a greater degree of mental and spiritual self-expression and yet the average of physical and mental possibilities that were open to the individuals of the race might be far lower than it had been before, through elimination of the best factors of the stock.

How many realize that at the present moment the national stocks of all civilized stocks appear to be definitely, if slightly, deteriorating? The realization is made harder by the fact that much of the effect is masked through the antagonistic but non-hereditary effects of sanitation, good housing, physical exercise, better medical treatment, etc., so that human individuals are on the whole bigger, healthier and longer-lived than they used to be. The deterioration is due to two causes—in the first place to the less rapid rate of multiplication of the best stocks, and secondly to the fact that many defects which in past centuries would have been grave hindrances, physical or economic, to their possessors, are so no longer; or else that we do not allow the sufferers from defects to suffer for them, but keep them alive in

special institutions. Bad sight, defective teeth, poor resistance to various bacteria, underdeveloped thyroid or pancreas, these and a host of other defects can be artificially compensated for, while mental defectives, congenital deaf-mutes and cripples of various kinds are cared for and as a result often allowed to reproduce.

A few years ago I saw a paragraph in a newspaper sentimentalizing over the marriage of two congenital deaf-mutes; and quite recently I heard of a woman who suffered from epilepsy being treated at a hospital to cure her of sterility. Public opinion does not tolerate a sufferer from small-pox attending a public celebration, or a homicidal maniac let loose in the streets of London. Why does it tolerate, and even encourage, such things as I have been referring to? The answer is partly that it has never thought straight about the matter, but also partly that, in so far as it has tried to think on the matter, it has been puzzled by the apparent irresponsibility of human heredity. When the average man sees a genius and a dunce in one and the same family, or a mentally defective child cropping up isolated in apparently sound stock, he may be pardoned for a little puzzlement, and for doubts as to whether any definite conclusions can be drawn on the basis of such a tricky process. It is precisely here that a little biological knowledge will be of the greatest help. A quite elementary knowledge of Mendelism will make it clear that such events are to be expected. New recombinations of old factors, leading now and again to startling divergencies from the normal, must occur, and whenever a character depends upon one or more recessive factors, it will turn up apparently *de novo* when two "carriers" of the recessive factors, themselves quite healthy, are married. Further, however, a little knowledge of biometrical results will convince them that while these apparent individual exceptions are and must be constantly occurring, the average of parents and offspring in bulk shows a high correlation. With such facts in mind, what we may call the eugenic idea becomes obvious, and public opinion will come to demand action.

The differential fertility of different stocks and classes within the nation brings us up against the population question, and the problem of the limitation of numbers, in the family and in the nation. and here again some biological knowledge is of very real importance for obtaining a sane view. The opponents of family

limitation by whatever means are given to expatiating on the "right of the child to be born." A little biological knowledge will show the meaninglessness of this. The ordinary woman is capable of producing between three and four hundred ova during her lifetime—each a potential child. Which of these have the right to be born, which have we the right to suppress? Not only this, but at each act of fertilization, not only thousands, but thousands of millions of male reproductive cells are swarming round the ovum, and the child produced by the success of any one of these would be different in character from that produced by the success of any other. Two plain facts must strike those who take long views—the first is that rapid multiplication can only be a temporary phase in man's history, for the world will in quite a few generations be full up with people, and that the only alternative to methods of barbarism like war, famine, plague or infanticide is some form of voluntary limitation. The other is that if, as is the case to-day, the more desirable stocks are increasing definitely, if slightly, slower than the less desirable, and that this relative infertility of the better stocks, is, as again appears, due mainly to voluntary limitation, then we should do all that we can to spread the knowledge and equalize the degree of limitation throughout all grades of society, so that limitation no longer has a dysgenic effect.

We may now pass to the topic usually known as "sex-education." It is, of course, obvious that a right attitude towards sex questions is among the most important aims of social hygiene. But the right course is a hard one to steer, for it lies between the devil and the deep sea. On the one hand there is the all-too-common attitude that the whole matter is somehow inherently degrading. Innocence—by which is meant ignorance—is to be encouraged, the whole attitude towards sex and its problems tends to become one of sentimentality combined with a furtive and often prurient prudery. On the other is the danger of over-familiarity,—of treating sex and sexual relations on an easy-come easy-go basis, like any other function of the body, so encouraging promiscuity, low standards, loosening of the bonds of family life, and thus indeed accomplishing a degradation.

However, the right attitude is perfectly possible, and we can achieve the result symbolized by George Meredith as a centaur—the union of brilliance of animal nature and animal vigour

with the best of human nature, the higher being in control of the lower. All psychologists are, I think, agreed that to achieve this with the minimum of struggle and difficulty in adolescence it is important that the child in its early life should not have acquired the common unnatural attitude towards sex as of something strangely secret and wrong, but, by having its natural questions simply answered as they arise, should never become burdened with this dark load on its conscious and sub-conscious mind.

It is here that biology may help, for if biology is taught, the facts of sex and reproduction must be taught too. It is not pretended that any amount of mere facts, however well inculcated, will prevent boys and girls having a stormy passage through the sea of adolescence. Abstract knowledge is one thing, but gradually to become aware within one of forces and desires that were not part of one's earlier nature, overpowering in their strength and vast in their possible power for good or for evil—that is another thing.

But biological fact can help. It can help to introduce the subject, and to make it natural instead of unnatural, so helping to release inner strains. And it can help the more mature to understand what not unnaturally puzzles many thoughtful people, namely, the extraordinarily large place which sex holds in human life. This becomes at least intelligible when we take our evolution into account, and remember that we are descended from creatures in which competition held full sway, the devil took the hindmost, and the strongest sexual instincts were a necessity if the individual was to achieve the goal of reproduction.

With a saner attitude towards sex there would inevitably come a saner and more humanist attitude towards other vital problems such as those of birth-control and of divorce.

Finally the biological approach is the best approach to the problem of disease and of health. Here there are two great antithetic problems—the prevention of definite disease and the enhancement of the active vital principle of health itself. We have done a great deal in the last century to counter the attacks of bacteria and other parasites, but an enormous amount remains to do. Relatively few people know much about hookworm disease; and yet it moulds whole nations. One of the universal symptoms of hookworm infection is general lassitude and a "don't care"

feeling about life. At least half the rural population of the Old South in the United States, and at least three-quarters of the population of the plains of India are afflicted with this pest Infection can be totally prevented by the wearing of boots (since bare feet are the chief channels of entrance to the body) and cleanliness and sanitation (since the parasite passes out with the fæces) The man who persuades the Indians into the use of boots and water-closets will alter India's soul. Yet how many politicians or how many Indian reformers know this simple fact ?

That is but one example out of many. Those who want to know what can be done in changing the face of a land by applying simple methods based on biological fact should read the Rockefeller Foundation's reports on their yellow fever campaign

It will not be in the least unreasonable in a hundred years or so to hope for an uninfected humanity But, again, it is needful first to persuade the populace of the truth of your facts before you can get them to move in practical measures based upon those facts

But as such wished-for consummation is more nearly realized it will become increasingly important to lay stress on the other side of the picture—on health as an active principle to be won, like all the rest of the things that are valuable in life, by the art of right living Here again biology can help It can show the rôle of quantity and quality of diet, of sunlight, of exercise, of rest It can demonstrate that play and sport are of biological importance even to animals ; it can point with obvious morals for humanity, to the difference between the alert, thrilling vitality of the wild creature and the dull nature of its stall-fed cousins.

It can emphasize the desirability, to man the organism, of periodic contact with nature, and so help us towards obtaining real "nature reserves" such as those established in America, as a necessity for any socially hygienic nation

There are other points which I would have liked to raise but I have not the space I would close by asking my readers to think forward a little into the future. In the future, as war becomes less frequent, conditions of life improve, inventions multiply, and the pressure of population slackens off so that we are not all the time presented with new pressing problems, due merely to increase of numbers, humanity will be able to

devote more of its energies to the things that are of lasting importance, to the improvement of living, and will be able to lengthen the views which it takes. As this happens, is it not certain that the science of racial biology and the art of social hygiene must come to play an increasingly important part ?

For the present the growth of public opinion on the subject is what is most urgently needed, and the best way to achieve such an intelligent public opinion as is wanted to make some knowledge of the facts of life a part of a general education

THE CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY TO SOCIAL HYGIENE

By CYRIL BURT, M.A , D.Sc.,

Professor of Education in the University of London.

I HAVE been asked to summarise in this short paper* the contributions made by the science of psychology to the problems of social hygiene. First, let me try to define the meaning of these terms : What is meant by psychology, and what is meant by social hygiene?

Psychology is simply Greek for the study of the mind , and the study of the mind is at least as old as Aristotle. What is new in modern psychology is the adoption of an experimental and a statistical technique. Down to the middle of the nineteenth century, psychologists were, nearly all of them, pure philosophers. They worked, not in the schools or the laboratory, but in the library or the study ; and their method was simply that of arm-chair introspection. " The philosopher," says the French satirist, " has always been too absorbed in himself to have time to discover or to penetrate the minds of those around him."† During the last fifty years, however, the methods of the physical and biological sciences have been applied to the problems of psychology. The psychologist has left his books and his papers, to test and analyse his fellow human beings. He has gone into the classroom, the factory, and the prison. He tries to measure the mental capacities of different children, of different workpeople, of different social classes, and of the two different sexes. He traces the causes of crime and of mental defect , he experiments upon the best ways of learning and the best methods of work. And the result is a vast and increasing body of exact and verifiable knowledge regarding the processes of the human mind.

Social hygiene is a newer term, and possesses a meaning less clearly defined. It is the object, I take it, of social hygiene to

* I am much indebted to Mr and Mrs. Flugel for their kindness in reading this paper in proof, and for the many corrections and suggestions they have been good enough to make.

† La Bruyère, *Les Caractères* (1687).

formulate, on a scientific basis, the principles that promote the health and efficiency of society. The British Social Hygiene Council has, so I gather, this general aim in view but it is particularly concerned with certain problems rather more specific, problems relating to the maintenance of the family as a social unit, to the reduction of promiscuous incontinence, and to the elimination of those infectious diseases which such promiscuity brings usually in its train—in a word, sex problems. There is a notion, prevalent at the present day, that psychology has lately become preoccupied with questions of this cast—that it has become engrossed in matters of sex. And it might be inferred that a psychology with these special interests would have a very definite message for any who have at heart those aspects of social hygiene to which I have just alluded.

It is, however, my firm belief—a belief which certain psychological schools may seem at first sight to contradict—that the sex instinct is but one among many miscellaneous human instincts. And I am convinced that it would be difficult, and indeed misleading, to consider that particular batch of social problems, to which the sex instinct has given rise, in separation from all the rest. No doubt it is true that much mental maladjustment springs from abnormal sex relationships; but it is no less true that abnormal sex relationships may arise out of mental maladjustment.

I propose, therefore, in the earlier portion of this paper, to treat these more specific problems rather by implication than explicitly. Social hygiene I shall take in the wide and comprehensive sense that I have just laid down, and I shall try to show, quite briefly, how modern psychology may assist in making human society at once more healthy and more efficient.

Society we look upon as a collection of human beings. But it is essentially a collection, not so much of human bodies as of human minds. Now the study of the human mind, as we have just seen, is the special province of psychology. Hence, it follows at once that psychology must have an intimate bearing upon social questions of whatever sort. Let us, then, ask what are the chief directions in which social health and efficiency may be disturbed, and what are the more important social spheres to which psychology has already made—and may make in the near future—some important contribution.

I — EDUCATION.

The first and the most obvious field is that of Education. I choose it to begin with, because it is natural to start from the social problems of the growing child

A — Psychology and the Home

The society in which the young child moves, at the outset of his life, is first of all his family, and later on his school. Let us take the family first. Here we strike at once upon a region in which the most remarkable contributions have been made by living psychologists. If we study the histories of those who give trouble to society, of those whose social life even at this early age becomes unhealthy, we are struck by one constantly recurring fact. There is, in nearly 90 per cent. of these youthful cases, some disturbance or disorder in the family life.

In a recent investigation upon juvenile delinquency in London I took two hundred consecutive cases referred to me for psychological examination, and obtained all the available data that might throw light upon the causes for their crimes. In 26 per cent. of the cases I found that the child lived in home surroundings that were definitely vicious, his parents were immoral, quarrelsome, drunken, or (more rarely) criminals themselves. In 60 per cent. of the cases the homes were not vicious but unwisely managed, at any rate, so far as the child was concerned, discipline was either too indulgent or too severe, or else too negligent and erratic to be called discipline at all. In 56 per cent. of the cases (including many falling into the previous group) one of the parents was dead, separated, or divorced; or the child himself was an only child or illegitimate; or had for some other reason been brought up by those who were not his true parents—by a step-parent, a foster-parent, or some remoter relative, or else away from home in an institution. Thus, in one direction or another, the family relationships were abnormal in nine cases out of every ten.

Much the same is true of those whose breakdown is not so much moral as nervous. An analysis of the mental history of most neurotic cases leads sooner or later to a story of disturbed emotional relations with one or more members of the family. Thus our studies of the abnormal child, whether he be delinquent or whether he be neurotic, bring us almost immediately, if we are thorough,

to a study of his early family life. The harm, no doubt, is gravest in the case of the very young. But the same conditions may have the same effect with those on the verge of adolescence, and their influence is almost as noticeable among younger boys and girls who spend six hours out of the twenty-four not with their families but in the school. More often than not, the troubles of the school child originate not in the school but in the home.

I have no time to describe in detail all that has been revealed by such investigations. The chief conclusions are fairly well known, though often gravely misinterpreted. Briefly, they may be summarised as follows :—

The child's social conduct, so far as it is influenced by what is acquired and not inborn (that is to say, by education, training, and instruction, rather than by heredity) depends largely on the formation of so-called "sentiments." Sentiments are organised systems of emotions and ideas relating to particular persons, principles, or objects. The first sentiment that a child acquires is almost invariably a sentiment for a parent—nearly always, in fact, for his mother. This sentiment, being the starting-point of a long series of similar sentiments, comes to have a supreme importance for all the succeeding years of life. Here, as elsewhere, it is always the first step that counts. The child's early sentiment for his best-loved parent becomes, as it were, the model upon which all other sentiments are formed, the hook from which the remainder are suspended, the dominating idea which, in the language of the text-book, "apperceives" most other human personalities that become important to it.

It is a commonplace to point out that, if a boy early acquires an antagonism towards his ruling parent—let us say, towards his father—then that attitude of antagonism will persist as he grows up, it will tinge and distort his first approach towards all others who subsequently stand to him *in loco parentis*—towards his big brother, his schoolmaster, his employer, and towards every person or institution or official that seeks later on to exercise authority over him. Similarly, if that boy conceives and maintains a tender affection for his mother, it is likely that, when he is older, the memory of his mother will operate as an ideal, and will stimulate him to respond with an active sympathy to all others who consciously or unconsciously remind him of her.

It is this that constitutes the basis of the so-called Oedipus complex. Like the hero of the Greek tragedy, every youth as he

grows-up tends to become the unconscious successor of his father. If, in his earliest years, he was led to love and admire his father, then as he grows up he will follow in his father's footsteps. If his father's treatment was unjust or injudicious, he will become for ever antagonistic to all that his father stood for. And if in any way his early family life was lacking or abnormal, he will be apt, before ever he knows what he is doing, to take a wild vengeance for the fancied or half-forgotten wrongs that were done to him in childhood *

Whether we accept such theories in full or not, it remains beyond dispute that the first few years of life, which every child spends as a helpless unit in his home and among his family, are bound to exercise a profound determining influence upon his social outlook all through his future career. It becomes, therefore, of the utmost importance to impress upon fathers and mothers that, from the very outset, they should remember that their child possesses not only a tender little body, but also a tender little mind; that they should think, not of its bodily health and physical well-being alone, but also of its emotional and moral development; and that above all they should realise this vital fact—namely, that though the child may never consciously recall the incidents of babyhood, his emotions are none the less being exercised, and his habits are being formed and fixed from the very earliest period—indeed, from the first few weeks of his existence. Any child who has not been a normal member of a normal household is likely to grow up gravely handicapped for future social life.

Here, then, is one profound and important reason for maintaining the integrity of the family as an essential factor in society.

B.—*Psychology and the School.*

Let us now take a further step and follow the child from his home into his school. Of all the branches of applied psychology none has been so arduously pursued as the psychology of education. What contributions has this branch made which bear upon social hygiene ?

* Those who care to study this perplexing subject further will find a sane and safe exposition of these doctrines in Mr. Flugel's recent book on "The Psycho-analytic Study of the Family" (International Psycho-analytic Library, 1921).

Until recent years the concern of the school psychologist was mainly engrossed with the detection and the training of the mentally deficient. Perhaps the most remarkable discovery of experimental psychology has been the invention of tests of intelligence.* These tests were first devised to supply teachers and school medical officers with a sound method for diagnosing mental deficiency. The English public is exceedingly anxious to preserve the liberty of the individual subject. It hesitates very much to sanction laws which (as it seems to the lay mind) enable a few doctors and justices to shut up a person for life in an asylum or other institution, pictured as little better than a barrack or a prison. To the general public, therefore, it should be highly comforting to know that the diagnosis of mental deficiency now rests, not on personal impression, not on the private judgment of an individual doctor, but on accurately standardised tests which will measure a man's intelligence almost with the same exactitude as a clinical thermometer will measure the degrees of fever.

The number of defectives in the population is not large. During school years they amount to but little more than 1 per cent of any given age group, and no doubt the part played by the mentally defective in the commission of crime and delinquency has been greatly over-estimated. Nevertheless, among juvenile delinquents, the proportion of mental defectives is as high as 7 per cent.; and probably among girls drifting into sex delinquency, and among hard and habitual criminals of maturer years, the proportion would be greater still. In spite, however, of the most definite regulations upon the point, many areas and authorities have failed almost entirely to discover the defectives that presumably are living in their midst. In their recent official reports, both the Board of Education and the Board of Control have commented on the incredibly low figures returned from certain districts, and it is vitally important that those districts should understand whether or not public opinion is likely to support official action in pressing for the proper ascertainment and the proper treatment of such defectives as undoubtedly exist.

* The most convenient description of the history and uses of mental tests is to be found in the report on "Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity," issued by the Board of Education (H M Stationery Office, 2s. net). A collection of such tests will be found in the "Handbook of Tests for Use in Schools," published by P. S. King & Son (3s. 6d. net).

Education departments and school medical officers are concerned mainly with picking out defective children who need special instruction in special schools. These cases might be termed the intellectually defective. I should like to press also for the definite recognition of another class of mentally abnormal persons, namely, the temperamentally deficient. These correspond partly, but not entirely, with the group termed in the Mental Deficiency^a Act, "moral imbeciles." The phrase "moral imbecile" is a misnomer, and the statutory definition is to my mind worse than useless. Nowadays, few doctors care to certify children or young persons under that heading.* By a temperamentally defective person I mean one whose emotions are so unstable and whose instincts are so strong and uncontrolled that he becomes a standing danger to society. The group would probably include a large proportion of future neurotics and lunatics, and would certainly embrace a considerable number of the most serious delinquents and incorrigible criminals. Could they be recognised at an early age for what they are, they might be saved from a career of crime, either by being segregated in special institutions or by receiving special treatment and training.

Intelligence tests, however, have done far more than help us to detect the existence of defectives. They enable us to discover a much larger and more important group of children, those whose intelligence is still well below the average, though not so far beneath it as to warrant certification on the ground of technical deficiency, these form the group alluded to in the Elementary Education (Defective and Epileptic Children) Act as the "dull and backward." While the defectives number but 1 or 2 per cent, the dull and backward number over 10 per cent. It is from this group that the majority of our paupers, criminals, and ne'er-do-wells are drawn. When we speak of the dull and backward we are apt to think only of the child at school—the child who cannot do his lessons, and who leaves in Standard IV instead of Standard VII. But, when he goes out into industry, such a person still retains the hall-mark of inefficiency. He is still dense, stupid, and incapable. And it is my firm belief that the establishment of special classes for the dull and backward, and the ascertainment of these dull and backward cases, would be of great

* See the "Symposium on Moral Imbecility," *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vol. vii. (1926), pp. 1-83.

assistance to those who had to deal with the foolish and incompetent in after-life, and might even lead to their being successfully placed in suitable positions where their lack of wits would matter little, and where they could still earn an honest livelihood by doing the mechanical routine-work that is inevitable in every community.

II — INDUSTRY

The next step that the child takes is to move from school to industry. How does psychology help us here?

Educational psychology as an experimental science appeared at the end of the nineteenth century. With the beginning of the twentieth century we find yet another branch emerging, that known as industrial psychology. In this country the National Institute of Industrial Psychology has been founded with a Fellow of the Royal Society, Dr. C. S. Myers, as its Director. It is the chief purpose of the Institute to study this special group of social problems by sound psychological methods.*

A — *Movement Study*

Industrial psychology has two main branches. The first is concerned with the general conditions of work. It seeks to increase the worker's efficiency and to eliminate waste of effort and undue fatigue. These aims it pursues by special investigations along scientific lines—by studying the best forms of payment and incentives, the best arrangement of hours of work and the most suitable methods of lighting, heating, and ventilation; it tests various modes of training the worker, it inquires what is the best way for his materials to be laid out, how he may stand or sit most comfortably, what are the most economical movements he can make, how production can be increased and accidents diminished.

Too frequently, I fear, the industrial psychologist is thought of as a man with a stop-watch, a ruthless "business engineer" suborned by the employer to see that the employees speed up to their maximum pace. In actual fact, the industrial psychologist is concerned just as much with improving conditions for the worker

* An excellent account of the work done in this country is to be found in Dr. Myers' recent book, "Industrial Psychology in Great Britain" (Jonathan Cape, 1926).

as with increasing output for the benefit of the employer. As an impartial observer, he enters the workshop, lives the workers' own life, and sets himself the workers' own task; he soaks himself first of all in the conditions of the factory. His recommendations are thus based in part upon personal experience. In spite of better education and better systems of factory control, the modern specialisation of industry tends more and more to reduce the worker to the status of a small wheel working in a vast machine—a machine towards which he is apt to feel apathetic or even antagonistic, simply because of his ignorance and lack of interest. By the various improvements that the psychologist introduces (for example, a heightened interest in the actual nature of the trade processes), much can be done to reduce that sense of monotony and drudgery—feelings which are otherwise bound to have a reaction after the hours of work are over, and so lead directly to vice and crime. He finds that bonuses and payment by piece-rate are far from yielding the sole or even the best incentives. The humane character of the management, the mental and social atmosphere of the firm, the satisfaction of the worker's individual interests, ambitions, and tastes, comfortable conditions outside his place of business—these are quite as important as a fair and equitable wage. The investigation of such questions is already leading to new and useful contributions to social hygiene.

B — *Vocational Guidance*

The other branch of industrial psychology is generally known as vocational guidance or selection. In this direction, as in the foregoing, important researches have been carried out quite recently in this country. In the schools under the London County Council, the National Institute, joining with a Government Department, the Industrial Fatigue Research Board, has set on foot an investigation into the possibility of choosing the most suitable employment for each child as he leaves the elementary school. Under the Choice of Employment Act there is a definite administrative machinery for giving such advice to every boy and girl.* The psychologist believes that the advice so given, based hitherto for the most part on informal suggestions from the teacher

* The provisions of this Act have since been incorporated in the Education Act, 1921 (Part VII, Section 107).

or from the official at the Labour Exchange, can be rendered surer, safer, and more scientific, by adopting psychological tests and methods. The quick, bright lad may find himself placed in a job that gives no scope to his high intelligence and zeal, the dull and dreamy youth may, by his parents' influence, have been given a post of initiative and responsibility that worries and harries his poor wits, the girl who can neither spell nor calculate may have been sent to be trained as a shorthand typist, simply because this was thought to afford a more respectable career than that of shop assistant or milliner, for which her practical abilities would really fit her; and almost every boy or girl may possess some special talent or aptitude which is liable to pass unnoticed, unless a search is made for it by adequate psychological means. All such misfits are likely to be discontented in their work, and to fritter away their energies and wits in useless frivolity or dangerous mischief. Meanwhile, valuable human material is lost to the community.

The movement for vocational guidance is still in its infancy. But, if the scheme proves practicable, we shall obviously do much to save people from industrial discontent and unrest, and perhaps incidentally to provide them with a better means of occupying their hours of leisure, as well as their hours of work.*

III.—MENTAL AND MORAL ABNORMALITY

So far we have followed the normal course of the growing youth. We have traced him from home to school, and from school to industry, and at each of these three points, as I have tried to show, psychology has contributed—and is still contributing—to the health and efficiency of society. And now, what of those unhappy individuals whose course fails to run so smoothly, whose minds refuse to fit into the social machine of which they form a part? Many a boy or girl, passing, at the age of fourteen, from the immediate supervision of parents and of teachers, drifts gradually into some temporary misconduct; and may find a way before long to the police court. Later in life, even should he have preserved his moral welfare unimpaired, he may suffer some nervous or

* A report on this inquiry has now been published by the Medical Research Council: "A Study in Vocational Guidance" (H.M. Stationery Office, 1926).

mental breakdown; and so once more, though in a different fashion, upset the healthy balance of the group to which he belongs.

The delinquent and the neurotic have of late attracted much attention from the psychologist; and a great deal is now known about the causes and cures of such disturbances. How far can we deduce general principles from what has hitherto been ascertained—principles which may be accepted as a positive contribution to social hygiene?

A.—*Juvenile Delinquency.*

Let us take the delinquent first. In London, a magistrate, teacher, parent, or official of the County Council, can now request a special psychological examination for any pupil attending one of the Council's schools. Twelve years ago the greater number of the children so referred were instances of educational backwardness or suspected mental deficiency. To-day the majority are cases of delinquency. I have already mentioned a special survey, lately made in London, of two hundred cases of this sort. It was the special purpose of this survey to ascertain what are the chief causes of delinquency in the young.*

In regard to this question, there is a long-standing controversy. Some contend that nearly every young criminal is a criminal born; it is argued that either he can inherit no moral sense, or that he must inherit a positive disposition to crime. Others declare that the criminal is not born but made; and the making of him they usually attribute to the poverty and ignorance in which he is brought up. An intensive study of individual cases shows that either view by itself is misleading and erroneous, but that, taken together, each supplements the other. Most juvenile delinquents are the victims at once of their heredity and of their environment.

What are the chief environmental factors making for delinquency we have discussed already. They are not material factors, nor physical factors, but emotional and moral factors; not lack of money, nor lack of education, but emotional disturbances in the child's family life. What are the chief hereditary factors?

* See "The Young Delinquent" (University of London Press, 1925)

The "moral sense" is not inherited but acquired; hence, defects in the moral sense cannot be innate. Nor is there any evidence to show that criminality or immorality as such is handed on from father to son by direct biological transmission. To this extent the results of these inquiries are hopeful and encouraging. The mentally defective, it is true, cannot be cured, but the so-called moral defective very often can.

If the commoner offences committed by the young are classified according to the apparent nature of the precipitating motive, it will then be found that they fall at once into certain well-marked categories, and these several categories, one after another, show a close and curious correspondence with the accepted classifications of the human instincts. The most definite offences are those of personal aggression, in which I include violence to persons, violence to property, and offences against the person without violence—like insult, annoyance, mental cruelty, false and dangerous accusations, and being generally beyond control. All these are reactions of anger, and anger is the emotion which, as modern psychologists tell us, forms the subjective aspect of the common instinct to fight. Sex offences are almost as definite and even more frequent, they, plainly enough, originate from the sexual instinct. Stealing and theft are related to the instinct of acquisitiveness—a propensity which is added to the catalogue of instincts by the majority of present-day psychologists. Running away and wandering may similarly be related to the migratory instinct; and so throughout the whole list. All these instinctive tendencies had a rough-and-ready value for the individual and his species under prehistoric and uncivilised conditions. In the parlour or the classroom their biological value disappears; they are regarded as naughty and even anti-social. Thus, whatever may be said of the crimes of adult man, the offences of the juvenile delinquent consist essentially, in almost every case, either of the hereditary reactions which constitute the universal human instincts, or else of slightly modified reactions elaborated out of—but still evidently springing from—the emotions that accompany them.

This proves a most instructive generalisation, alike for prevention and for treatment. These instincts are all inborn, and are therefore ineradicable. Hence, it is useless to try to stamp them out or annihilate them, or to meet them simply with rebuke,

punishment, and summary attempts at suppression. Yet they are not inevitably criminal or vicious. They may be sources of helpful energy and effort. What we have to do, therefore, is to give them rational and lawful outlets, to turn them aside from their crude and brutish manifestations, and either harness them to some useful form of social activity, or else provide a vent for them in some form of recreation or sport.

Already the teacher has been reaching this practical corollary by a somewhat different route. Madame Montessori and a host of modern educationists have insisted on the necessity of what is called "free discipline." Alike in the classroom and in the home, there is to be a minimum of restraint; as little as possible is to be forbidden. The child is to be permitted to find his self-expression in the way that seems most natural to him. It is believed that, in a wholesome civilised society, within a school or a household or a team that enjoys a healthy moral tone, the form of expression that the child strikes out for himself will be, not a primitive, dangerous, animal reaction, but some perfectly legitimate response. Perhaps the most impressive evidence for the soundness of this theory is to be found in the history of the free colonies for young delinquents. Here troublesome young people of either sex are brought together, and left to work out their own salvation with little or no interference from outside authority. When turned loose and allowed to manage their own affairs, they at length start organising a miniature society, with laws and codes and traditions of the most admirable type, all on their own initiative.

B.—*Sex Delinquency*

Of the various instincts that I have named, the one with which the Council for Social Hygiene is more especially concerned is the instinct of sex. In the present stage of civilisation it seems one of the most perilous and perplexing, and it surely affords one of the most convincing demonstrations of the truths I am endeavouring to enforce.

Ordinarily, the most frequent offence committed by young people is stated to be theft. Of the offences that are officially recorded, nearly 80 per cent, at any rate among boys, are larceny or offences akin to larceny. Among girls, however, sex offences are almost as frequent. Probably, if we had a complete history

of both boys and girls alike, and if we thought as seriously of sex delinquency in the male as we do in the female, sex offences would rank as the commonest of all. Owing to the innumerable troubles that follow in its wake, it is, beyond doubt, one of the most disturbing features of juvenile life. We may, therefore, attempt to examine it more closely.

Under the lead of such writers as Havelock Ellis, Freud, and Jung, recent psychology has thrown much light upon the workings of this human—or (shall I say ?) this animal—instinct. Popular opinion has been corrected on several important points. To begin with, it is a notion widely current that the sex instinct does not emerge until puberty, and that it then bursts forth abruptly as a single and simple procedure for the sole purpose of propagating the race. This is a notion which any observant teacher in a slum neighbourhood could immediately correct. Freud, to mention no others, has made it eminently clear that the sex instinct is a thing that develops slowly, and that its first beginnings are to be found in early infancy. Time after time little children are sent to me from the infants' department at the tender age of five or six charged with the most amazing malpractices of this order, and these little youngsters are not in any other way abnormal or exceptional. Usually, owing to the conditions of their home and upbringing, they are a little more aggressive in their actions, and more precociously informed in their knowledge, than the child from a better social class; for the rest, they have simply inherited the ways of our savage and ape-like ancestors.

The same early beginnings may be discovered in almost all forms of juvenile delinquency. Dr Goring and Dr Stanley Hall, indeed, have printed tables to show that the career of the habitual criminal usually commences during adolescence. That is certainly the impression left, if the age incidence of the charges recorded at the police court is taken at its face value, and plotted as a graph. Investigate, however, a little more closely the full case-history of almost any adolescent delinquent, and you find at once that the story of his offences pulls out like a telescope, and nearly always reaches back to an earlier age. There are, it is true, certain exceptions, there is an important group of cases where the instability that accompanies adolescence is of itself a sole and sufficient cause of crime. The child has hitherto led an unblemished life; and the strain and stress of puberty, joined with the sudden change from

strict supervision at home and at school to the freedom and independence of industrial life, suddenly turn a child with the best of records into a temporary criminal. Such cases, however, are rare; and the child whose strong instincts lead him into crime, whether the instincts be instincts of wandering, anger, acquisitiveness, or sex, often displays his propensity during the earliest years of childhood.

In one other important respect the current conception of the sex instinct has been revised by recent psychology. Freud, as is well known, has insisted that what we popularly call the sex instinct is really a bundle of instinctive tendencies, each of them capable of developing into a specific form of misconduct. He has shown that what are commonly called perversions are, at any rate in the tiny child, comparatively natural forms of behaviour. This, again, is a fact which any watchful teacher could confirm. Thus the sex instinct is not simple, but multiple.

The same, I believe, holds good of nearly every so-called instinct. McDougall, for example, has shown us that the instinct of fear can be analysed into at least two or three subordinate partial tendencies; some show their timidity by shrieking and fleeing in a panic, others by crouching still and keeping silent. A similar distinction could be made in the case of anger; one child gets violent, and shouts and screams and fights; another becomes sullen or sulky. Thus the classification of instincts which I have just suggested, and which, in point of fact, I have adopted mainly from McDougall, is in some ways arbitrary. We are not to think of the instincts as separate, sharply defined faculties, each inherited in entire independence from the rest. They are all composite reactions. And each of them in turn might be regarded simply as a specific modification of the sum total of emotional energy—the life force, the *élan vital*, or whatever we prefer to call it—that keeps each one of us, and our species as a whole, alive and ready to assert our own existence. Here, perhaps, we can learn something from the writings of Jung to supplement those of Freud. Jung, if I understand him rightly, insists strongly upon the unity of this fundamental emotional energy, an energy which he calls *libido*, and, in his view, the ordinary reproductive instinct, on which the Freudian lays so much stress, is but one among many of its primal manifestations.

Hence, just as according to Freud many things which are not ordinarily thought of as sexual prove to be partly sexual in their origin, so I am inclined to say that many things that are ordinarily thought of as sexual have a partial origin in some totally different instinct*. For example, many petty practices that are put down as improper or obscene among young children have their foundation, not in a sex interest at all, but rather in the instinct or reflexes of excretion; and the specific emotion of disgust, aroused in a mild, pleasurable, and almost piquant form, supplies an essential constituent in their crude enjoyment. Again, many of the amorous adventures of the youth or girl in civilised life are attributable, not solely to the sex instinct, but also in part to the hunting instinct, the youth prowling after the girl, the girl promenading after any lively and likely youth, are simply stalking each other because the streets of the modern city provide no other animal to chase. Much misbehaviour, too, that looks to the careless eye to be flagrantly sexual, is really based on another form of affection, the so-called maternal or protective instinct. The youth is protecting his girl, the girl is mothering the youth, and their embraces are much more those of parent and child than of two paramours. It is true that one mode of activity is apt to switch over into the other, and that an innocent piece of sport or affection may suddenly create a physiological disturbance and so kindle a more sensual instinct. Yet this need not surprise us. It is a transformation that we ourselves should anticipate, if, as I have already maintained, the emotional energy that sets these impulses into action is, really and at bottom, an overflow from a single fund of vital force.

But, of all the contributions which contemporary psychology has to make, perhaps the most important is its insistence upon individual differences. It is a fact to be observed and emphasised in every region of the mind. Among the remarkable discoveries revealed to us by mental testing I have already mentioned the wide and varied range of inborn ability. The differences in instinctive and emotional make-up are just as enormous.

* Much of course depends upon the way in which the term "sexual" is defined. Freud, as is well known, adopts an unusually wide view of what may properly be called sexual. Here I use the word in its commoner and narrower sense.

Take, again, the sex instinct. It is the traditional view that every male has an instinct so strong that it is practically uncontrollable whether he is married or not, and that the female is comparatively passive and submissive, with little interest or pleasure in open sexual acts. This is demonstrably wrong. It is popularly deduced from the mere existence of prostitution, yet any first-hand study of prostitution should be sufficient to refute it. Unfortunately, most investigations on this problem have hitherto been prompted by an interest primarily in the social or economic factors, and so have tended to overlook the psychological

C—*The Psychological Causes of Prostitution*

Recently, at my suggestion, a probation officer attached to one of the larger police courts in London, has attempted an inquiry into the causes of prostitution. The numbers studied are at present too few to yield reliable statistics*. But I have added her data to my own, and may perhaps venture to give a provisional summary of the results that emerge.

As in other forms of juvenile delinquency, many different factors may contribute towards the ultimate lapse. A few prostitutes—chiefly those of the lowest type—are mentally deficient; the majority are dull, and nearly all are emotionally unstable. General innate mental conditions of this sort have an undoubted influence, the girl is unable to get or to keep a satisfactory job, and at the same time her judgment is too obtuse or too erratic for her to hold clearly in mind the danger and the degradation of a dissolute life. In many instances the home environment forms another predisposing factor. In 23 per cent. of the cases studied the parents were vicious, neglectful or incompetent; and, in an additional 12 per cent. (at the very least), the discipline had been too weak, too severe, or in other ways injudicious. It is true that 30 per cent. of the girls had comfortable homes to which they could have returned, had they

* The number so far analysed amounts to 143 cases. The cases I myself have studied are mainly police court cases referred to me for examination by magistrates or probation officers, or else cases originally referred to me while still at school, and subsequently followed up by the aid of a few voluntary workers. To those who have thus aided me in the collection of data I have to express my sincerest thanks.

chosen, but 16 per cent. were altogether homeless, either from childhood or soon afterwards—many coming from orphanages or from workhouses, where they had been trained for domestic service.

Occasionally some event in the girl's history was responsible for her downfall (though not, indeed, so frequently as their somewhat romantic narratives would seem to suggest); 2 per cent had been deserted by their husbands, 4 per cent had been seduced by friends, by employers, or even by relatives during early childhood, 6 per cent. had been turned out of their homes, or had lost their situations, owing to some youthful escapade. It is instructive to note what a large proportion of prostitutes have been domestic servants—an occupation where nowadays employment can nearly always be obtained. So far as employment is concerned, domestic servants, together with waitresses and actresses (usually chorus girls or dancing instructresses, though the phrase is often a vain and meaningless euphemism), furnish over 80 per cent of the total number. Shop girls and factory girls account, in my cases, for most of the rest.

Only 7 per cent seem in any way to have been genuinely forced into prostitution by economic need. But most of the girls possessed tastes and inclinations which the normal earnings of a person with their intelligence could never hope to satisfy—a love of drink, dress, or self-display, of extravagance and luxury, and of all the varied excitements that life in town can afford, and many seemed constitutionally too lazy to earn even what little they could by regular hours and early rising, and by an honest life of daily drudgery. Less than 5 per cent were sincerely willing to return to their own homes or to accept and stick to a decent occupation when it could be found.

So far, these figures tally with conclusions reached by most other social workers.* But the factors which to me seem more significant than any are but lightly touched upon in previous studies of the problem. The chief psychological characteristic of

* Of the vast literature on the subject, much of it unscientific and ill-informed, the following publications are well worth studying: Havelock Ellis, "Psychology of Sex" (esp. Vol. VI, "The Task of Social Hygiene"); Abraham Flexner, "Prostitution in Europe"; C.O.P.E.C. Commission, "The Relation of the Sexes", and "Downward Paths" (a book published anonymously under a trust by G. Bell & Sons).

the prostitute (so far as such persons have any single characteristic in common) lies, not in her intellectual endowment or its shortcomings, but in her temperament, she shows, not so much a deficiency of intelligence as an excess of emotionality*. She seems, when her brazen mask is broken through and she shows herself for what she is, a gay, wilful, self-indulgent creature, singularly restless and strangely inconsistent, vain yet hopelessly untidy and careless, concerted yet devoid of genuine self-respect, full of foolish laughter yet easily depressed, indolent and yet adventurous, quarrelsome and yet easily led. All her instincts and emotions are apt to be over-developed. But, above all, in more than half the cases I have analysed the girl has been demonstrably over-sexed. Of all single causes, therefore, I am inclined to lay most stress on the excessive and precocious sexual nature of the girl herself.

Prostitution is usually defined as the promiscuous offering of sex relations for money or mercenary considerations. It is supposed to exist because the female has no direct psychical interest in the matter, but is simply sought out by a male who is willing to pay for what he wants. This may be true when the practice has become a habit, but it is far from indicating the real origin of individual cases. It is, for example, seldom recognised

* For the proportion of mental defectives among habitual prostitutes the figures given by lay observers are wholly untrustworthy. Thirty per cent and fifty per cent are the proportions given by two witnesses before the Royal Commission on the Feeble-minded. In America the percentages obtained in early investigations with the Binet-Simon tests were higher still. My own cases yield a proportion of about eight per cent who are mentally defective on the ground of inadequate intelligence, and a smaller proportion who are temperamentally defective. Cases near the border-line, but undoubtedly above it (the dull, the unstable, the psychopathic), are far commoner than those who can be certified.

Of course, as a class, prostitutes are as heterogeneous as any other social group. Motives and temperamental characteristics differ widely in different cases, and much of their superficial resemblances must arise from a similarity in ways of life. Hence my generalisations are true only of a large proportion, not by any means of all. I believe, too, that the predominant type is changing; and that formerly the cold, calculating money-seeker was more common, and the unstable, emotional creature less ubiquitous. This, however, is difficult to demonstrate, for in the older person the emotions are apt to get masked and repressed, and perhaps even to atrophy with loss of adolescent vigour.

that in the streets and works of most large towns, there are girls as well as youths who are seeking the opposite sex—girls in good positions, who need no money and are in regular work, who yet find this simply a convenient way for meeting fresh acquaintances, and of gratifying their primitive emotions. And in at least 85 per cent of the cases I have collected the first lapse from chastity (and often the first series of such lapses) arose in some more or less emotional situation in which the girl's own sex instinct evidently played an essential rôle, cash or its equivalent formed no part of the inducement.*

I take it that the man has been willing to pay because he thinks he must indemnify the girl against three great risks—the risk of disease, the risk of pregnancy, and the risk of losing social caste. Now, it is my growing conviction that the conditions of modern civilisation are, at any rate in England, rapidly diminishing each of these three dangers. Both men and girls are now alive to the perils of disease and of pregnancy, and are becoming fully aware of the means of preventing them. Methods which were popularly supposed to be the trade secret of the prostitute are to-day the common knowledge of the ordinary youth and young woman. Moreover, the freedom accorded to the modern girl, together with the change in ethical standards, is doing much to abolish the reproach that formerly attached to any person of the sheltered sex who showed too frequent a preference for clandestine adventures in the company of a single male. All the reasons,

* The age of the first lapse fell in a majority of cases at about fifteen or sixteen years of age. It is, as a rule, only among those who begin their career comparatively late—after the age of twenty—that a more or less deliberate choice of prostitution for the sake of emoluments begins to form the predominating motive.

Lombroso states that prostitutes are generally frigid ("La Donna Delinquente," p. 401), and most other writers seem to adopt or to follow this view, e.g., in this country Merrick, the former chaplain of Millbank Prison ("Work among the Fallen"). But nearly all the evidence so adduced seems to be derived from a knowledge of hardened *habituées*, who, naturally enough, can hardly seek or find much physiological gratification in the regular exercise of their trade. With the young beginner, and with the older woman in her non-professional relationships, the opposite story is nearly always to be heard. With many, too, the subtler psychical requirements that are usually far more necessary to the woman than to the man, seem less essential as a pre-condition to excitement and gratification.

therefore, for compensating the girl with money are rapidly disappearing ; and if girls are to be found whose own sex instincts are as urgent as those of the men, then payment becomes no longer necessary.

If this theory is correct, it would follow that prostitution as a mercenary trade is bound, in the course of another half-century, to diminish and die out. The place of the professional woman of the town will be gradually usurped by the unpaid amateur, the casual wanton, and the more faithful mistress who proffers herself only to one lover at a time.

The improvement of economic conditions alone could never bring this change about. Wages may be improved. Unemployment may be reduced. But never, under any conceivable conditions, could industry be expected to offer to girls of eighteen or twenty a wage which could compete with the average takings of the prostitute. Prostitution, as such, therefore, will slowly vanish ; and it will vanish as it has appeared, not for financial reasons, but for psychological.

The gradual equalisation of the sexes is assisting to bring this about. And modern psychology suggests that this equalisation can, and doubtless will, go much further. One striking result of mental measurements has been to demonstrate that the innate differences between the sexes are far smaller than is popularly supposed. If we discount the effects of tradition and training, men and women differ very little in their average inborn capacity, the sex differences in mind are far smaller than the sex differences in physique. On the lower mental levels, like those of simple sensation and movement, they are larger, it is true, than on the higher levels ; and in emotion and temperament they are larger than in intelligence. But, at their greatest, they are never very wide, and everywhere the mental differences between one sex and the other seem swamped by the differences between the component individuals.

This applies to the sex instinct as to everything else. The individual differences in erotic nature, which are found among males, affect the female almost equally. There are girls who are impelled quite as strongly by physical cravings as any man ; and there are girls who find quite as much pleasure in lustful practices as the most lascivious *roué*. Indeed, since for physiological reasons the woman is capable of more frequent intercourse

and of more frequent sex pleasure, the demand on her side may sometimes prove the greater. Hence, when the main deterrents are removed from the female sex, there is likely to arise, at any rate temporarily, a more general tendency to promiscuity, and this tendency, in my view, will prove the main factor in abolishing the demand for prostitution.* Already, in point of fact, almost every woman of the streets may be heard bewailing this result: she is only too eager to describe how "straight girls" and "working girls" are performing her special services, and declining to accept money in return. And worldly-minded libertines, who once thought it far less reprehensible to resort to *cocottes* than to have intimate relations with a respectable girl of their own social class, are beginning to reverse both their code and their practice.†

At first sight it might look as though we were but substituting a worse evil for the former. And certainly there are reasonable grounds for alarm. But here, again, I think, modern psychology steps in. To whichever sex they belong, the persons who are thus uncontrollably impelled by the strength of their inherited instincts are, after all, comparatively exceptional. It is, for example, a widespread notion that prostitution is a necessary evil, essential in the interests of monogamy, and an unavoidable consequence of late marriage; for, it is said, no young man can successfully remain continent for ten successive years. All this, I should contend, is based on a complete misconception. It seems a tradition, handed down in certain schools, and in certain classes or cliques. Repeated as a sure but secret fact by the older man to the youth and by the youth to the boy, this belief in the sexual needs of all healthy males becomes accepted as an axiom; and almost hypnotises every lad who meets it (and most lads do) into believing that illicit intercourse is both irresistible and natural.

* It is interesting to recall that, forty years ago, Charles Booth recommended that houses of accommodation, instead of being summarily suppressed, should be tolerated temporarily as a step towards the eradication of the brothel ("Life and Labour in London," vii, 1889, p. 128). Already in England the brothel has practically disappeared.

† I am strengthened in my views by finding that the facts I have observed in my own limited field are borne out by the experience of most social workers at the present day. Rescue workers, settlement workers, probation officers, and court missionaries, seem generally to have noted the changes I have commented upon.

He is led to expect that this forbidden pleasure is the greatest thrill that he can experience. Again and again both youths and girls will admit how surprisingly they were disillusioned and disappointed, when their curiosity at length impelled them to make an actual experiment. The spread of accurate sex enlightenment should correct this furtive article of faith—a dogma which is as prevalent as it is harmful, and as ancient as it is erroneous.

Such traditions have been altered in the past. They can be altered again. A hundred and fifty years ago seduction was thought as inevitable and as venial as the resort to prostitution, is in many circles held to be to-day. "Throughout the eighteenth century it was assumed that no man possessed of proper virility could be left alone with a young woman without making an attempt on her virtue." The girl expected it, the man expected it; and so it happened. Even if it did not, everyone believed it had. And it was thought as human and as manly as being carried away drunk from the dinner table night after night. Much of this, at any rate, public opinion has already changed. And the increasing realisation of the equality of the sexes will carry the change still further. One of two things must occur. Either the sex habits of women in the future will approximate to the sex habits of men in the past, or a new sex control among the men will approximate to the former self-restraint of women.*

Modern psychology seems to indicate how such control may be attained. It must be achieved, not by negative methods, like punishment or constraint,† but by positive efforts and con-

* "Even the former," adds the C O P. E. C. report, "would not be so brutalising to either sex as is prostitution."

† I venture to suggest that, instead of arresting at intervals (and almost at random, as it seems to the women themselves) those who solicit in the streets or are caught violating decency in the public parks, each policeman might be instructed simply to allow no known or obvious prostitute to be seen loitering upon his beat; she need not be arrested or charged, but merely "moved on" and driven quietly but incessantly and ruthlessly away. At present, the officer is supposed to gain credit for an occasional arrest, it should be to his discredit if even an occasional prostitute is occasionally seen. Some such instruction, so I gather, has been responsible for the remarkable change in the streets and parks of New York. No doubt such a measure would convert an open vice into a hidden one; but the psychologist attaches the greatest importance to the suggestive power of flagrant display. When temptation is out of sight, it is more easily kept out of mind. And the more

structive plans—by making a better provision for the lonely person in his idle hours, by the substitution of higher interests for lower interests, of permanent friendships for passing spasms, and by a more liberal intercourse between the two sexes which shall consist not in physical intercourse but in social intercourse—though either indeed at bottom depends on the same instinctive energy. The power which will blow up a house or set a town on fire can be used to drive an aeroplane or to propel an Atlantic liner. All that is necessary is to provide the appropriate mechanism instead of a stray match.

The school of psycho-analysis tells us that a vast number of wholesale social activities derive their strength from sex emotion—art, music, poetry, religion, and creative activities of every kind. The doctrine is apt to shock the ordinary layman, but it carries with it a hopeful corollary. It follows that sex emotion can be worked off—or “sublimated,” as the phrase goes—by diverting it into these more useful and legitimate channels. Time after time I have had cases come before me, in which I have successfully suggested some method less coarse and less perilous through which an equivalent enjoyment might be obtained, and presently the youth or the girl has come back and said that, after all it was “much more fun” to go talking, or dancing, or doing work in company with the opposite sex, than to simply yield to a few minutes’ animal pleasure. Thus, in the long run and in the last result, the very freedom with which the two sexes are now thrown together is likely, I think, to diminish rather than to increase any crude activities of a licentious kind. And this conception of “sublimation” provides a most useful principle on which both preventive and curative measures may helpfully be based.

I am, therefore, no pessimist about the future of these sexual problems. Civilisation seems to have taken each instinct in turn,

difficult the traffic is made, the rarer it will become. At present, the common sight of the smartly-dressed street-walker not only wakens the dormant appetite of the man who passes by, but also advertises a method to the young, and innocent girl, who often begins to envy the life of well-clothed idleness which the other seems to have attained.

Nor should the “fallen woman” be treated as an outcast, whether by law or by public opinion. The ostracism of the unchaste makes it harder for them to return to chastity. To the psychologist what counts is not so much a momentary weakness of the body, as the slow corruption of the mind.

and gradually to have elevated it in the way I have described. In early communities the acquisitive instincts of the component individuals seem to have formed the chief stumbling-block. Everyone seized what he wanted. Step by step, with the introduction of industry and earning, and the growth of a sentiment for property, the acquisitive instinct became transformed from an immediate grab to a useful, wholesome, industrial activity. Later on the instinct of pugnacity gave the same trouble. Each man avenged his own insults, killing or wounding his fellows directly his anger was aroused. And I suppose, just as people are now declaring that prostitution will always remain with us, because the sex instincts are an ineradicable part of human nature, so five hundred years ago our ancestors were saying that fighting, duelling, and the barbarities of warfare would always persist, because the instinct of anger was an ineradicable part of human nature. Already, by the process of sublimation, save for a few exceptional outbreaks, we have mastered the acquisitive and pugnacious instincts. So, too, I believe, when the time comes, civilisation will succeed in sublimating the instincts of sex. Sex offences there must always be, and a good deal of the emotional energy is bound to run to waste in useless sexual sport, just as, in other forms of sport, anger and the hunting instincts still survive, and vent themselves in crude and primitive ways. But the main force of the sexual instinct will in the near future, I am convinced, be controlled, ennobled, and refined, and become the source and spring of worthier social interests.

I have taken the sex instinct, because it illustrates, in a most striking fashion, how the simple biological tendencies that we inherit from our prehistoric and animal ancestors may give rise to personal difficulties and slow demoralisation, thus upsetting the health and efficiency of society as a whole. But, as I have insisted at each point, what I have said of the sex instinct could be applied with the necessary changes to almost every other human instinct and emotion. And here, as it seems to me, modern psychology is aiding us to understand and to cope with some of the most perplexing social problems of the day.

D.—Nervous Disorder

I have left myself little space to deal with the nervous or neurotic. It is in this field that some of the most remarkable contributions of recent psychology have been made.

At present we pay little or no attention to the nervous child in school. The physically defective are discovered during the routine medical inspections, and are duly treated. The mentally defective must now by law be ascertained, and duly removed to special schools. The dull and backward are noted by school teachers, and may be transferred to special classes or given individual attention in the ordinary class. The delinquent is brought to the police court, and then placed on probation or sent to some residential place of safety, or, through the work of the school care committees, may be effectively dealt with at an earlier age before his habits have become fixed. But the nervous or neurotic are almost wholly overlooked.

It is sometimes said that neuroses are the product of civilisation, and that social life under modern conditions is increasing instead of diminishing their incidence. It is alleged that, during adult life, neurotic disorders are responsible for more social inefficiency than any other single group of diseases. Certainly, they are diseases which as recent work has shown are fully amenable to prevention and cure. Nor can it be doubted that, if potential neurotics were detected and treated during childhood, much personal unhappiness and social incompetence could be saved, and many could be rescued from serious nervous breakdown or from definite insanity in after-life.

In the main, the causes of neurotic disorder lie in those very circumstances that I have already touched upon; and, in point of fact, most of the principles that I have just been putting forward have been drawn very largely from the special study made by medico-psychological writers in the field of psycho-analysis.

As is well known, the school of psycho-analysis has, in this connection, laid much stress upon the sexual instinct. Such a theory is not so new as is sometimes supposed. The very name "hysteria"—the term applied to the commonest forms of psychoneurosis—carries with it, by its ancient etymology, a suggestion of sexual derangement. The extreme view—that all neurosis originates from the sex instinct—we need not accept. I doubt whether the most ardent Freudian would now maintain such a view. Freud himself unquestionably admits both the existence and the importance of other human instincts. Under the conditions of modern civilisation, however, it is the sex instinct which becomes most easily aroused, and which has at the same time to be

most constantly and most completely repressed. It is this so-called repression that seems to be a main factor in the production of nervous disorder.

Repression is a technical term, and means not conscious restraint but unconscious suppression. The notion that any psychologist would recommend sexual incontinence as a healthier alternative to sexual repression is an utter misconception. Indeed, many would maintain that sexual incontinence is far more likely to give rise to mental conflict and disturbance than is sexual restraint. What the psycho-analyst advocates is not licence but sublimation—a full and candid recognition of these tendencies, and an endeavour to direct their energy into higher paths instead of trying to deny their existence or to trample them out.

Into the question of the sexual enlightenment of older children I cannot enter here. The psychologist is all for candour. But at the same time he points out that the main factors in mental disorder are not intellectual but emotional, hence mere knowledge is not by itself sufficient to effect a cure, or to provide a safe preventive. Indeed, in matters of sex, as in everything else, knowledge alone may at times be more dangerous than ignorance. Accordingly, wholesale sex instruction, without duly considering who is to impart it, or to whom it is to be given, or in what ways, or at what stages—all this the psychologist would deprecate rather than advise.

Among older persons from the better classes there can be no doubt that, directly or indirectly, sexual emotions are frequently responsible for nervous disorders. But with younger children, particularly with those of the elementary school class, such disorders seem to originate, not so much from the child's emotional relations towards the opposite sex, as from his emotional relations with members of his own family. This, indeed, is a point that I have fully dwelt upon in the outset of my paper. Here, therefore, I need merely draw attention to yet another reason why the integrity of the family life should be maintained and preserved.

Were I to sum up the chief conclusions of my paper in a single sentence, I should say that the main contribution made by modern psychology to social hygiene lies in its study of individual differences. The study of individual differences in intelligence, on the one hand, and in emotion, on the other, has formed the

chief line of advance in recent mental science. The practical deduction has not perhaps been so widely stressed; but it is obvious, once the facts are admitted. It is to treat each child or person as a unique individual, with his own peculiar needs, with a special constitution, a special history, a special problem of his own, and, if we could only find it, a special place to fill, where his talents may be used and developed, and society be the gainer rather than the loser by his short life in its midst.

ADDRESS ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIAL HYGIENE.

By B. MALINOWSKI, Ph.D., D.Sc.,
Reader in Social Anthropology, University of London.

THE anthropologist who has to lay down the claims of his science before a forum of social reformers is in a somewhat embarrassing position. The reformer looks ahead into a state of improved humanity—the anthropologist can only invite him to look backward into degraded savagery. The reformer has to plan hygienic regulations, social enlightenment and moral uplift—the anthropologist, as a rule, specializes in the explanation of crude, cruel and immoral practices. Thus the picture which Anthropology gives us of primitive mankind, is on the whole gloomy, though perhaps unduly so, as I shall try to establish presently.

And indeed what could we learn from prehistoric man or his compeer, our contemporary savage, that could be of direct benefit to us? Certain supremely hygienic arrangements primitive man has known and practised. As one who has lived for some time in a village high on piles over a Melanesian lagoon, I can assure you that no modern system of sewerage can equal that of our neolithic lacustrine ancestors. But alas, however we might envy and admire them, imitation is out of the question, for you cannot build a skyscraper on piles, nor move London into the Thames. An excellent device to deal with old-age questions, again, is to eat up your aged kinsmen after they have ceased to be useful and before they have become too tough; effective avoidance of the mother-in-law; miraculous cures by magic: unlimited borrowing from the uncle without the need of return—all these are savage customs which appear attractive to us, but which would not work in our own society. But in all of them modern prejudices, if not conditions, prevent us from following in the footsteps of our primitive forbears.

By all this, however, I do not want to imply that Anthropology can only supply us with jocular comparisons and ridiculous parallels. It can be made very useful indeed, provided its

teachings are not applied directly, naively and crudely to modern conditions. And against this it is necessary to utter a warning. For there is a tendency among social students to recommend certain reforms because similar conditions are found in savagery, or can be assumed as an early stage of human development. Writers in sympathy with Socialism or Communism for example are fond of emphasising the alleged absence of individual property in primitive cultures—an assumption which careful investigation proves to be unfounded. From this they draw the extraordinary conclusion that primitive communism warrants success in the nationalisation of the coal industry, of railway systems or what not. Engels, Bebel, Kautsky, Cunow and many others develop this idea whenever they touch Anthropology. Even as recently as some three years ago, one of the masters of modern Anthropology, the late Dr. Rivers, speaking as prospective Labour candidate for Parliament, tried to develop the theory that Socialism and Communism are not incompatible with human nature; in its support he dwelt on “the socialistic or even communistic behaviour of such societies as those of Melanesia”; describing also primitive “clan-organisation with its many communistic features”

Again, recently a theory has been propounded that primitive man is a thoroughgoing pacifist, ignorant of war, fighting and perhaps even bad language, and innocent of any combative tendencies. No sooner was this utterly fallacious view advanced than a number of earnest pacifists took it up as a valid argument for their propaganda. I am, myself, an ardent and intransigent pacifist and rather in sympathy with Socialistic doctrines, but I am not prepared therefore to imitate the savage or prehistoric man in any of his antics, customs or deficiencies. And as Anthropologist I know that primitive man, in the person of the lowest modern savage, is a born fighter, and that woman and wealth are the main bones of contention in all ages and all societies. The naïve argument, drawing its cultural ideals from savagery—the anthropological ancestor-worship as we might call it—has been nowhere more rampant and harmful than in the study of sexual relations, marriage and family, the main subject of this paper.

In fine, we may say that Anthropology, neither in joke nor earnest, should invite the reformer to take inspiration from

savagery, or to imitate primitive man. Nor even, because a certain state of affairs can be proved or assumed to have existed, is it safe or useful to maintain that it is compatible with human nature. For as we shall see, the way in which man behaves at any stage of development is the result of cultural influences as well as of biological endowment, and it is not at all easy to disentangle human impulses from cultural habits and to state definitely where nature ends and nurture begins.

There are, however, weighty reasons why Anthropology must be considered not only useful but indispensable to social reformers. The present organisation, the British Social Hygiene Council, sets out to study and improve or at least safeguard the most important institutions of our society—the family, marriage, sexual morality and the education of the young. In this the Council and we all realise two points. First of all that we are now in a period of transition, of quick change—not always for the better perhaps—in a state of society which awakes forebodings and arouses hopes, and which therefore invites control as well as solicitude. The second point fully realised by the Council is that nowadays social control must be based on scientific principles. The appeal to established morals, to religious dogma, and to tradition, may be good or even necessary. But it is not sufficient under present conditions. In order to advise the statesman and to educate public opinion about domestic morals, we have to know what the scientific foundations of these morals are, what are the origins and history of human marriage, what is the nature of the human family. In all this the Anthropologist must be at hand, for it is his speciality to study in a dispassionate analytic and comprehensive manner the past stages of human institutions.

It can be claimed that Anthropology, the study of primitive custom and belief, is extremely important to the social reformer, in that it widens his outlook, endows him with an unprejudiced frame of mind, with a rich material for mental experimentation, and with knowledge about the nature of human institutions, morals and ideas. Last, but not least, it allows us to give a forecast of future development on the basis of past history.

With all this, Anthropology, like every human effort, is liable to error. In the theories of primitive promiscuity, of

group, marriage, and of economic and sexual communism—which are all in my opinion erroneous—it has introduced a certain amount of ferment and confusion into the ideas of social reformers. In what I am going to say, I myself shall therefore have to pronounce upon certain matters yet scientifically *sub judice*. I shall not only state the present-day controversies upon the subject, but also take a decided part in them. As we shall see, sound Anthropology, while it clarifies thought, broadens the mind, and renders our ideas more plastic and tolerant, does not teach anything subversive, immoral or “Bolshevik”

Let me proceed to substantiate these claims and to develop briefly the history of Anthropological thought as regards the institutions of marriage and family. Up till relatively recent times, about the middle of the last century, matters appeared to the students of the subject in a very simple fashion. The two great authorities of our Christian civilisation, the Bible and Aristotle, contain positive statements about the origins of marriage and the importance of the family. To the mediæval theologian and to the nineteenth century sociologist, marriage appeared respectively as a divine, and as a natural institution and the patriarchal family as the cell of society, while any deviations from monogamy were regarded as exceptions, lapses or irrelevancies. Even as late as 1861 Sir Henry Maine could affirm that it was difficult to see “what society of men had not been originally based on the patriarchal family.” This simple doctrine, the Adam and Eve theory of primitive marriage, as we might call it, was based on authority rather than on observation, on reticences rather than on the frank discussion of facts, on belief and moral prejudice rather than on a dispassionate desire for truth. Anthropology, therefore, was doomed to modify if not to explode this theory, and it did so with a vengeance.

The announcement of the theories of primitive promiscuity, and of the gradual evolution of marriage came with all the appearance of a sound and genuine scientific discovery. A number of students hit upon it independently and simultaneously; as soon as announced it was almost universally accepted; and soon a mass of evidence began to pour in from various parts of the world to substantiate the new message.

The first, perhaps, to hit upon the new ideas was the Swiss scholar Bachofen, who through the study of classical myth and

custom thought he could reconstruct the original social status in which men and women lived in indiscriminate sexual freedom or "hetairism" as it was called by its discoverer. Through this, women attained a high social status, the household was ruled by the mother, matriarchy, not father-right, was the foundation of primitive society. Independently of Bachofen the American Lewis H. Morgan was led by the study of the so-called classificatory nomenclatures of kinship to similar hypotheses. According to him, human society originated in complete sexual promiscuity, passed then through consanguine family, punaluan household, group marriage, polyandry, polygyny and what-not, arriving only after a laborious process of fifteen transformations into the happy haven of monogamous marriage. Simultaneously with them, McLennan and Lord Avebury in this country, Giraud-Teulon in France, Post in Germany were arriving at similar conclusions and substantiating them with elaborate arguments. From savage countries came corroborating evidence furnished by Howitt from Australia, Codrington and Fison from Melanesia, Kubary from the Micronesian Islands, Wilken from the Malay Archipelago, Grandidier from Madagascar, Kowalevsky from the Caucasus.

And here again these new revolutionary and sensational theories had hardly been hatched out in the innermost anthropological incubator, before they were translated into the language of popular propaganda and used to bolster up certain political programmes and social utopias. To the Socialists of the Marxian school all evils were due to private rights, exclusive privileges and vested interests. Their formula, the formula of historical materialism, was not so much "*cherchez la femme*" as "*cherchez les écus*"—but they did not forget woman, though she came as an afterthought. Since individual appropriation was the sin of capitalism, marriage, the bourgeois individual appropriation of that priceless though not primary article, woman, was an evil and was to be abolished. Instead of this, free love, or a limited matrimonial communism, was to mark the millennium of Marxian society. As we know, the practical Marxians who have recently tried to establish a millennium in Russia made a number of sporadic and abortive but none the less extremely harmful attacks upon the institutions of marriage and family. So the social reformer, looking for a scientific basis for his projects and

deals, is bound to probe into the foundations of such opinions, which if true, would seriously impair his conviction in the universality and importance of family, marriage and sexual morals. Thus the practical value of anthropological argument is by no means fictitious or recondite. Nor is the theoretical state of affairs finally settled.

I cannot retrace step by step the gradual development of views and controversies, from the first famous attack upon Morgan by McLennan, until the quite recent polemic between Rivers and Westermarck. Enough to say that up to the present moment the controversy flourishes, not to say rages, and that Anthropology is divided into two camps upon almost every question connected with primitive marriage, sexuality and family life. Like many a savage tribe, anthropologists are in this matter organised according to the dual principle, divided into two moieties or phratries, one claiming descent from a patriarchal pair, the other from the communistic horde, the one having as its totemic ancestor the monogamous ape, the other the promiscuous baboon, the one having Morgan for its patron saint, the other Westermarck. We are now confronted with the task of gaining a clear idea of the points at issue and of forming our own opinion as to the rights and wrongs of either side.

Among the questions debated, the original problem as to the beginnings of human marriage still occupies a prominent place. Morgan's theory of unrestricted promiscuity has in fact but few adherents among serious anthropologists to-day, though it still shines with an afterglow among such popular writers as Ivan Bloch, Muller-Lyer, Buschan and Finck. On the other hand, Professor Westermarck's diametrically opposite assumption that human marriage is a simple continuation of the monogamous pairing of anthropoid apes commands, as we know, the adhesion of but one half of the anthropologists. Starting with Sir Henry Maine and Andrew Lang it has been supported in this country by the late Ernest Crawley and Mr. N. W. Thomas, in Germany by Eduard Grosse, Father Schmidt and Father Koppers, in America by G. E. Howard, Lowie, Goldenweiser and Kroeber, in France by van Gennep. The other camp, the present day followers of Morgan among serious anthropologists, having jettisoned promiscuity, join their master at a later stage of his scheme and begin with group marriage. The idea which has

moved into the foreground is that in primitive society the clan and not the family is the primary unit, and that primitive man leads a group existence, while his individuality is hardly yet developed. Associated with this—urge the modern Morganians—there existed and even exists a form of marriage in which totemic groups, classes or clans and not individuals are mated. This group marriage or “sexual communism” as it sometimes is called, is responsible for the classificatory forms of kinship nomenclature; for the present-day organisation of clans, classes and phratries; for the world-wide institution of exogamy; for certain survivals of sexual licence, and for serious forms of so-called anomalous marriage. This scheme of ideas—one might call it the modernised and bowdlerised form of Morgan’s hypothesis—has been advanced by Fison and Howitt, by Spencer and Gillen and by a number of other noteworthy fieldworkers. But in its most scientific and plausible form it has been recently advocated by the late Dr. Rivers, it has the support of Mr. Sidney Hartland, the partial adhesion of Sir James Frazer, Mr. Havelock Ellis, the late Professor Durkheim and many other anthropologists and sociologists of the very first order. In fact the modified theories of Morgan are on the whole supported by a greater number of very eminent students than are the opposite views. Associated with the main issue of group-marriage and clan supremacy there are theories as to the priority of mother-right over father-right, the value of linguistic testimony in classificatory terminologies, hypotheses about the existence of anomalous marriages, and the significance of certain forms of sexual licence.

To put some order into this mass of queries and quibbles, let me first remark that a number of questions which are debated even at the present time may be ignored in a serious discussion, because they rest on pure unverifiable conjecture, and are of no scientific or practical importance. I shall exclude from our present consideration questions of first origins, and of historical priority, as well as most of the elaborate linguistic reconstructions and the problem of anomalous marriages. They are due to conceptual illusions and an incorrect way of posing the problem, as I hope to show in a book on “Kinship” shortly to appear. For the present being concerned with practical and pragmatic sociology, we shall put on one side all the problems of mere antiquarian interest. We shall concentrate on a comprehensive survey of

present-day savage societies ; analyse the conditions as we find them from the biological, sociological and psychological points of view ; and try to gain a clear vision of the fundamental institutions of marriage, family and sexual morality. Above all, we shall try to establish how far these institutions are based on individual bonds and how far they are of a communal character. Thus we shall not aim at hypothetical reconstructions of imaginary stages or historical events which for an anthropologist are for ever beyond empirical verification.

✓ In order to proceed at once to the core of the problem, let us examine the arguments advanced in support of the existence of promiscuity, group marriage and sexual communism. These arguments are drawn first from interpretations of sexual license as survival of primitive conditions ; secondly, from the alleged existence of group marriage among present-day savages, and thirdly, from the linguistic testimony of kinship systems. This last proof I shall have to leave unchallenged, for it would lead us into extremely complicated, dry and technical questions : I shall only bluntly state as one who has studied and used in actual converse with savages a number of classificatory systems, and as one who has made a special study of most theories, that linguistic evidence proves nothing or next to nothing as to the earlier forms of human mating. It is significant that field-workers who either professedly were not linguists, like Dr. Rivers, or else gave no evidence of practical or theoretical knowledge of savage speech, like Morgan, Howitt, Spencer and Gillen, were most fascinated—almost obsessed by the linguistic argument, while theoretical linguists like Pater Schmidt or Wilhelm Wundt, or again, anthropologists who have made a special study of native languages like Professor Kroeber, Mr Gifford and the present writer, show the greatest scepticism as to the value of language in sociological reconstructions.

I shall pass now to the arguments drawn from sexual license. It is not the task of an anthropologist to indulge in the white-washing of humanity whether on low or on high levels of culture. The first thing to be stated plainly and to be grasped clearly is the fact that sexual morality among so-called savages, though never completely absent, is very different from our own ; that although they are, or were until we taught them ignorant of the greatest evils which beset us, such as prostitution, venereal disease and

surreptitious vice, they tolerate, on the whole, a great deal of laxity.

It will be best if we treat the subject under three headings: pre-nuptial license, occasional customary excess; and the relaxation of the marriage bond.

Pre-nuptial license is the most prevalent status in savage communities. There are, however, a number of tribes in which chastity is regarded as essential in an unmarried girl, and there are even a few in which young men as well are expected to remain continent till marriage. It is noteworthy too, that all the most primitive peoples belong to this category. But it must be admitted that in a great majority of savage societies—throughout Africa and America, in most parts of aboriginal Asia, in Australia, the Pacific and the Malay Archipelago—there obtains a considerable sexual laxity. A rapid survey of the various tribes and their distribution would be useless and a detailed description is impossible, so I shall merely make reference to the easily accessible and most interesting works of Professor Westermarck, to the *Mystic Rose* of E. A. Crawley and the *Psychology of Sex* of Havelock Ellis.

I shall instead give a detailed account of a typically lax people and describe the sexual life of Melanesian youths and girls in the island communities of New Guinea, where I have spent a couple of years engaged in ethnographic field-work. Though the sexual liberty of these natives is very great, they are not devoid of moral restrictions. First of all the rules of exogamy debar morally about one-fourth of womenkind from every man. In the second place, both marriage and family entail a definite sexual taboo, that of adultery, the transgression of which is punishable. Neither the prohibition of clan-incest nor that of adultery is absolutely and rigidly obeyed, but they do establish definite moral distinctions and standards. And both prohibitions aim directly at the protection of the family and of marriage.

Where none of these restrictions operate, sexual freedom is considerable. It begins very early, children already taking a great deal of interest in certain pursuits and amusements which come as near sexuality as their unripe age allows. This is by no means regarded as improper or immoral, is known and tolerated by the elders and abetted by games and customary arrangements. Later on, after boys and girls have reached sexual maturity,

their freedom remains the same, with the result that there is a great deal of indiscriminate mating. In fact at this age both sexes show a great deal of experimental interest, a tendency to vary and to try, and here again a number of arrangements and customs play into the hands of these juvenile lovers. As time goes on, however, and the boys and girls grow older, their intrigues naturally and without any outer pressure, extend in length and depth, the ties between lovers become stronger and more permanent. One decided preference as a rule develops and stands out clearly against the lesser love affairs. It is important to note that such preferences are clearly based on genuine attachment, resulting from real affinity of character. The protracted intrigue becomes a matter of public notice as well as a test of mutual compatibility, the girl's family signify their consent and marriage is finally concluded between the two lovers.

The custom of two lovers living together on trial before marriage is made possible by the institution of the communal house of unmarried boys and girls. To a superficial observer such a mixed household, inhabited by several couples, might appear as the realisation of group marriage. In truth it is merely a convenient arrangement, and there is a perfectly clean and clear separation of each couple from the others within the dwelling, there are no traces of promiscuity and strict decorum and delicacy are observed within such a house. The whole thing, moreover, is not a marriage but merely an arrangement preparatory to it. I may add here also, that in general among these highly licentious Melanesians, manners in public are excellent as regard the subject of sex, as also in most other things. No crude or obscene language is to be heard in mixed company and their delicacy of feeling is great in these matters. Among men alone, of course, or women, it is different. It might be said that their drawing-room manners are excellent though their smoking-room and boudoir conversation falls very far short of the standard*.

One more point must be mentioned in connection with their sexual life. Though they have a great freedom of intercourse,

* These statements cover a complicated state of affairs which cannot be adequately compressed into a few words. Compare for more details *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (Kegan Paul, 1926), and *The Father in Primitive Psychology* ("Psyche" Library, 1926).

remarkably enough there is no freedom as to its consequences. An unmarried girl must not become a mother. It covers her with shame, makes it difficult for her to marry, and brands the offspring for life. This postulate of legitimacy is the more remarkable as these natives have no clear idea about physical paternity. Prevention is said to be carried on by certain methods but abortion is more prevalent. I may add that although the question of legitimacy in lax communities has not been recognised in all its importance by Anthropology, we have sufficient data to affirm that a similar state of affairs, that is, freedom of intercourse with a taboo on illegitimate children, obtains among many peoples. In the Trobriands this prohibition is very effective and pre-matrimonial children are extremely rare.

I have gone into the details of the conditions in Melanesia for they are typical of all lax communities throughout the world.

Without accepting a brief in defence of their morality let us see in what way the natives conform to certain standards. First of all, though the sexual history of an individual begins very badly with infantile license, later it runs on somewhat more natural lines, improves as it progresses, and ends well in a selective, monogamous and exclusive marriage. The curriculum has yet another merit. It allows marriage to be based on a great deal of sexual experience and upon a good knowledge of what life in common means. Marriage is thus prepared and improved by this pre-nuptial unchastity, it is purified in its foundations, in the desires and impulses which lead to it. It is not contracted under the pressure of sexual impulse, but with the craving to settle down and to live a full community of life with a woman chosen for personal qualities rather than mere attractiveness.

We can therefore explain this type of pre-nuptial license by its function. Far from being a mere negation of marriage it is well adapted and preparatory to it. All this it is true is obtained at some physiological, social and cultural cost, but since the institutions of marriage and family are the real aim, and since these remain safe and even safeguarded the cost seems to be well balanced by the results.

Thus, the explanation of license as *the survival* of primitive promiscuity appears to us rather futile and far-fetched. This interpretation obviously ignores the serviceable and useful functions of license, and overlooks its extreme vitality, its organic

adaptation to other institutions, and the great sway which it has over native mentality. A survival is something that remains merely by virtue of inertia, an echo of former conditions. Whatever pre-nuptial license might be it is certainly not a decrepit, faded custom.

Moreover, the mere correlation of license with levels of culture explodes any theory of survival. For on this theory such laxity should flourish among the peoples of lower culture, who are nearest to the primeval state of supposed promiscuity or group-marriage, and as we advance to higher levels it should disappear. Now we find on the contrary that the simplest tribes—the primitive food gatherers of the inaccessible jungle, the Veddas of Ceylon, the Negritos of Malaysia, the Pygmies of New Guinea and Central Africa, the Firelanders and the Bushmen all know little of any sexual excess. They seem to be the only representatives on earth of really chaste beings, who not only preach but practise purity. When we pass to higher peoples the correlation between level of culture and freedom of sex becomes complex, erratic and ambiguous. In Australia, for instance, most tribes were licentious, but there were others on the same level of culture who were not. In Melanesia I have myself worked among tribes, living side by side with each other, having an almost identical culture, and yet radically different in respect to sexual morality. The Polynesians again are by no means puritanic, but there are peoples in Asia and Africa on the same level of culture who are as moral as seems possible to man. I must refer you again to Professor Westermarck's surveys for detailed evidence. The failure to correlate license with cultural level puts any theory of survival entirely out of court. I think that to a certain extent, freedom in sexual matters could be correlated with the size of the tribe and of its local settlements, with the equality of man and woman in a culture and with the absence of unnatural practices. However, this might be, we must conclude that pre-nuptial license is not a survival of group marriage or promiscuity, but an adjunct, a complement and a by-product of individual marriage.

Let us pass now to the occasional outbursts of sexuality, the orgies at critical periods, the sexual excess during feasts and gatherings, and the practices associated with the religious and magical ceremonies. Here again we must dismiss the explanation by survival, because these practices appear only at a higher level

of culture, because they are very much alive, because they form an essential part of institutions, and above all because they fulfil a specific function. The savage, who is normally repressed to a considerable extent, needs occasional outbursts and relaxations, especially at crises, moments of great emotional or religious enthusiasm, and at those periodical times when man leaves behind ordinary work-a-day reality and sees the world transformed in his festive mood. On such festive and extraordinary occasions not only the sexual restrictions are removed, and not only is the sexual appetite stimulated but the ordinary discipline is relaxed, the normal occupations abandoned and social barriers over-ridden, while at the same time people indulge in gluttony, in desire for amusement and social intercourse. It is incorrect to explain one aspect of such an institution by one theory and the rest of it by another, especially in the teeth of the fact that the whole forms an organic unit. Sexual license as well as the other relaxations, liberties and ebullitions at such feasts fulfils the important function of providing a safety-vent which relieves the normal repressions, furnishes people with a different set of experiences and thus again tends to safeguard ordinary institutions. This type of license, again, cannot be a survival and we can only explain it by recognising that it corresponds to certain characteristics of human nature never thoroughly tamed, and that it is a compromise which safeguards the normal rules of matrimonial exclusiveness.

The third type of licence consists in the relaxations of marital ties, such as wife-lending as a form of extended hospitality, temporary exchange of conjugal partners, the famous *jus primae noctis*, and various renunciations at the beginning of marriage. Such customs are usually considered by the "promiscuity" anthropologists as violating, almost destroying the bond of marriage, and therefore proving that this institution in its individual form has not yet taken firm root in certain savage societies. This mode of interpretation imputes to the savage mind an essentially foreign and sophisticated point of view, and it applies to savage cultures a measure borrowed from our own Christian civilisation. In fact, it is a conception of marriage in which this institution is identified with sexual exclusiveness.

This is quite one-sided and erroneous. A clear idea of what the institution of marriage is, as we find it in savage communities,

a correct definition of this concept for purposes of social Anthropology, should have presided over all discussions of the subject and should have been part of the aim of the researches. And yet anthropologists have been so busy reconstructing past stages or histories, arguing against each other, demolishing rival hypotheses and making up a dozen new ones for each one demolished, that they have forgotten to make clear what it is all about. The older writers, Morgan, McLennan, Tylor and Lubbock following the use of language and even more of polite reticences and circumlocutions which make marital relations equal to sexual intercourse, identified in turn marriage with sexual access. Of the wider biological issues, the legal factors and the psychological forces which all enter into the bond of marriage they knew nothing. Later on, in the voluminous works of the German school, the legal aspect of marriage was emphasised, and marriage was defined by Kohler, Post, Cunow and others as legalised sexuality. Quite recently Dr Rivers has repeated in a more refined and less sterile manner the same definition "The institution of marriage has two great functions, it is the means of regulating sexual relations, and it is the means of regulating descent, inheritance and succession."*

Of these Dr. Rivers argues "the primary and fundamental function of marriage is the determination of the place which each newly-born individual is to take in the social structure" This view completely passes over the most important aspect of marriage and family, the biological one. The primary function of marriage is neither sexual nor sociological, but consists in securing the continuity of the race, the safety and education of the young and the happiness of the parents. Combined with this and dependent upon this, marriage and family also make possible the continuity of human culture and the cohesion of human society. To define marriage by its sexual and by a recondite legal aspect is indeed an arbitrary and artificial narrowing down of our anthropological vision.

The best concept of marriage so far framed is that of Professor Westermarck, who in a succession of works upon the subject, has gradually extended and deepened his idea of this fundamental institution, until he gives us a ripe and considered definition in

* "History of Melanesian Society," Vol. II, p. 145.

a last edition of his *Marriage*. Westermarck includes the biological, social, legal and educational elements in his definition and he is very clear about the close connection between marriage and family; the impossibility of defining the one without the other.

But even Westermarck does not do full justice to the psychological and personal aspect of the twin institution. Marriage and family embrace large portions of human life; they are the scene in which domestic and daily existence is permanently laid, they are the condition of personal happiness of the two partners; and they leave a permanent imprint upon the mind and character of the young. All this is so simple, so wide, so pervading that it has been practically overlooked by learned sociologists and anthropologists. For nothing is so difficult to see as the obvious, and nothing is so difficult to grasp and to portray as the medium in which we live. And yet the element of personal happiness and the common adjustment of individualities through life should define marriage, not merely in novels, but also in scientific discussion. For as a matter of fact the essence of marriage for the individuals concerned is personal happiness. This means, sociologically speaking, that marriage as a thriving institution must be based on the union of assorted personalities. Opportunities for a proper choice, the elimination of mere lust and of mean calculation—these are the conditions of a sociologically sound institution of marriage. From this point of view all the contextual elements of marriage—rules of pre-nuptial mating, economic inducements, systems of descent, and so on—should be studied in any culture, low or high. From this point of view we have seen that pre-nuptial sexuality, occasional licence and certain other customs can be adequately and satisfactorily explained. From this point it could be shown that the economic setting of marriage must be regarded as means to an end, that of permanent personal relationship, and not as an end in itself.

The view often taken by the writers of the school of historical materialism of marriage as merely an economic institution, of the wife as slave and drudge, is as inadequate as the purely legal or sexual one. We must resolutely face human nature as it is and not forget what is most important to man—his personal happiness. We must define marriage as a lifelong or extended union of man and woman entered into from the motive of personal happiness, to be achieved by common existence; by keeping

each other permanent company, supporting each other in economic matters, exchanging a number of domestic services, living sexually together, and undertaking to assist each other in the rearing and education of children. In this the husband as the bodily stronger and mentally more active partner has to act as protector while the woman, besides the biological duties of child-bearing and rearing, carries on most of the domestic business.

It is clear that in this definition we have combined marriage and family, and indeed marriage is but one aspect of family life. But although the continuity of race and culture are no doubt ultimate ends of both institutions it is important to realise that no good family life can exist in association with an unhappy marriage. This is one of the most important lessons of anthropology. It is as incorrect to omit the psychological and personal element in the one as to overlook the biological aspect in the other. Our definition covers both patrilineal and matrilineal family and the various forms and varieties of the institution of marriage. It is no exaggeration to say that there is only one form of marriage of any sociological importance and that is monogamous marriage. For simple numerical reasons polygamy is always an exception—usually the privilege of the rich and powerful—even among the peoples who avowedly practice it. Polygyny as we find it among primitive tribes is merely an agglomeration of several households in which the husband leads alternately monogamous existence, passing from one wife to the other. Polyandry obliterates superficially the monogamous aspect of marriage to a much greater extent than polygyny but even under polyandrous conditions the union either ceases to be a marriage in any sense of the word or is a succession of monogamous unions. A developed harem is, I submit, never and in no sense of the word marriage, but harems and similar arrangements are but the luxury of a few exceptionally wealthy in certain high cultures.

In all these discussions on marriage and family anthropology has committed the sin of one omission: it has failed to take into account human nature and human life. We have already had a psychology without the soul and in the modern behaviouristic school even without consciousness. We had a science of ethics without morals, and I understand that there is now an attempt to make theology without God. But against an anthropology without Man I should like to protest on this occasion.

Armed with the correct idea of marriage we can now have a look at the alleged group marriage, which has been the most formidable argument in favour of Morgan's theories. On the first rebound of Morgan's hypotheses group marriage was discovered in Central Australia by Gason, a police trooper, by Fison and Howitt, amiable and intelligent amateurs ; it was rediscovered later on by Frank Gillen, a postal official with an excellent knowledge of the natives, and by an eminent zoologist, Sir Baldwin Spencer. There was not one single sociologist among them. The evidence collected by Professor Seligman about the South Massim of Bartle Bay has been re-interpreted in the same manner. Group marriage could be also read into the facts which I have collected in the Trobriands, where, as I have already mentioned, there exist communal boys' and girls' houses, and even more so into some evidence which I have collected from the Sewa district of Normanby Island.

Now as a first-hand observer as well as a careful student of all the material published I have not the slightest hesitation in affirming that group marriage does not exist in any of these tribes, that it has never existed and could not have ever existed.

What are the facts retailed under this title in the various accounts of field work and theoretical discussions ? Among the Dieri, Arabana, Yantrawunta and the cognate tribes of Central Australia, a married woman may be placed in the so-called *pirrauru* relationship to a man other than her husband. Such a man may, with the husband's permission, have access to her on rare occasions. Or if the husband be absent and give his consent the woman may join her paramour for some time at his camp, but this is apparently rare. This in a nutshell is all that is to be said about this institution in Australia. It simply amounts to the fact that in order to lend his wife a man must wait till she is allotted by the tribal elders as the *pirrauru* to another man. Then he may consent to waive his marital rights for a short time, though we are expressly told he is under no constraint to do so. Circumstances, jealousy, even the disinclination of the woman are obstacles all of which must make the carrying-out of *pirrauru* rights extremely rare.

However this may be it is an obvious misnomer to call the *pirrauru* relationship a group affair. It is always a temporary and partial surrender of marital rights consisting of a long and permanent connubium with occasional rare episodes of concubinage, a primitive marital triangle not unlike the one we know from the

modern novel as well as from law reports. We might indeed as well say that group marriage exists in modern fiction as that it does in Australia. But above all the *pirrauru* is not a marriage in any sociologically acceptable sense of the word. As to the alleged existence of cognate forms of group marriage or sexual communism in Melanesia I think I have made it sufficiently clear that the communal house of the Trobriands is merely a convenience for a number of affianced couples to carry on their liaison. Even less of a group marriage are the important sexual customs discovered by Professor Seligman. Dr. Rivers, again, seems to be convinced that in the Melanesian Archipelagoes "we meet with definite evidence for the existence of sexual communism, not merely in the past but even at the present time." But when he comes to redeem his promise of the "definite evidence" we are merely given certain linguistic usages, restrictions between certain relatives, and kinship customs which only by a considerable strain and some twisting can be regarded as *survivals* of some previous conditions *

As it stands the evidence is to me absolutely unconvincing as regards any sexual customs whatever. The term *communism*, moreover, which Dr. Rivers puts more precisely as "the possibility of sexual relations between a group of women and a group of men of considerable size" is clearly a misnomer. Such a possibility obtains in the modern European communities between practically every man and every woman, for in Melanesia as with us a man has to court a woman, she has to respond, and then they may mate or marry. Possibility of possession, whether economic or sexual, is in no sober speech "communism."

With this we have disposed of the main arguments adduced in support of primeval promiscuity, group marriage and similar institutions. But our results are not merely negative. We have been able to explain sexual license by its cultural function and to show that there always exists sexual morality side by side with it. We have been able to understand the relation of the various forms of license to the institution of marriage and to the rules of sexual morality. We have framed as the result of our discussion a definition of marriage and stated the intimate connection between this institution and that of the family. We have found

* Rivers, "History of Melanesian Society," Vol. II, p. 132. Cf. also Vol. I, pp. 181-182.

above all that in these problems it means starting from a wrong end when too much prominence is given to sexuality.

It is the relation between parents and children which largely determines the conjugal partnership. The relation in daily life and within the household of the mother to her child, and of this to the father, are therefore the cornerstone and foundation of kinship and marriage, and indirectly of sexual morality. Yet here again we have to register an almost complete neglect of this subject on the part of anthropology. And once more we must attribute it to the difficulty of seeing the obvious. To the champions of family and of monogamy, motherhood appeared so clear that they found nothing to say about it. It was sufficient to mention the biological fact and to ridicule the idea of group-motherhood, as was done by Westermarck, Lang and Thomas, in order to bring down Morgan's house of cards. The other side, notably the later supporters of group marriage, like Kohler, Durkheim and Hartland, pointed out that maternity is a biological fact, hence irrelevant for social conditions, hence to be banished from anthropology. Maternity, the most important fact in the life of man, fell thus between two stools, and in the heat of the battle was trampled out into complete oblivion.

It is one of the most important achievements of Rivers that he was the first to face boldly the idea of group motherhood. Assuming rightly that culture modifies all natural forces in marriage and in parenthood, he argues that nothing can be put down as obvious, biological or natural, before it has been empirically tested. He further shows that by indiscriminate adoption, communal suckling and a joint rearing of children, a sociological group maternity, is at least as possible as group marriage and that there are definite indications from Melanesia which make group-motherhood even probable.* Dr. Rivers even indicates the manner in which this matter should be investigated in the field. The only defect in his position is that having been twice in Melanesia after the enunciation of this theory he has done nothing to verify his hypothesis or to check it, and has brought home no new facts of crucial importance upon the problem of parenthood.

* v. Article "On the Origin of the Classificatory System of Relationships" in *Anthropological Essays Presented to E. B. Tylor*, 1907, reprinted in *Social Organisation*, 1924. Cf. also *History of Melanesian Society* Vol. II, pp. 136 and 138, where he speaks of the "community of children," which is, according to Dr. Rivers, associated with "sexual communism."

Nor are the reasons for that difficult to find. The study of family life, especially of motherhood and paternity is theoretically so difficult and practically beset with so many obstacles that no one but an expert sociologist who at the same time is prepared to remain for years in one tribe and even in one community, to learn their language and to live their life, can adequately approach the subject. Dr Rivers, whose work was always done through interpreters and with a more or less rapid survey of the facts, could only be expected to collect but the most superficial evidence about parental relationship. It is then no accident that among all the kinship elements discussed by him in his *History of Melanesian Society* the relation between parents and children occupies a diminutive place*. Neither he nor to my knowledge any other anthropologist has devoted to the very foundations of kinship—I mean to parenthood and the family—anything like a sufficient analysis. What the writer of perhaps the best monograph on kinship says with undue modesty of his own considerations, that “they are not penetrating enough to reveal our true desiderata—the ultimate origin and reason for existence of the most commonplace terms of kinship in every language”—could be appropriately said of most anthropological studies of the subject†.

I shall therefore have to place before you once more the evidence collected in the Trobriand Islands and the adjacent archipelagoes of N.W. Melanesia—the only region which so far has yielded adequate all-round information upon the important subject of parenthood.‡ In the light of our full knowledge of the subject, however, it will be possible to utilise the data from other parts of the world. Maternity, as I found it in Melanesia, is rooted in biology but in no way is it left to biological and instinctive forces alone. The bond between mother and offspring begins to be the subject of sociological influences from the early stages of pregnancy. As soon as a woman becomes aware of her prospective maternity, her life undergoes a radical change. She has

* All he has to say about it is practically disposed of on one and a half pages—Vol. II, pp 13 and 14.

† The quotation is from E. W. Gifford—“*Californian Kinship Terminologies*,” 1922, concluding paragraph.

‡ Part of it has already been published in the two books mentioned in “*Sex and Repression*” and “*The Father*”.

immediately to take up a number of taboos, and carry on certain ritual observances for the benefit of the future individual. There is thus an immediate cultural response running side by side with any instinctive reactions and forcing the woman to be aware of the new life she has within her. As pregnancy progresses other members of the community are mobilised as well, but not as group "mothers" to the new baby, only as assistants to the prospective mother, who remains the centre of an elaborate pregnancy ceremonial, receives a number of services and gifts which she has to repay later on, and finally becomes secluded in a special house, separated from her husband.

In all this maternity is made into a mixture of instinctive responses, biological factors, sociological dictates and traditional ideas. Having studied all this from the sociological point of view, especially as to whether there is any communal or group motive in it, I am able to affirm that maternity remains throughout the most personal, individual and exclusive relationship. All the ideas, customs, regulations, moral norms and nursery arrangements are thus set up not merely to allow, but also to impose individual motherhood as a duty, as a privilege, in fact as the one and only possibility. There is no communal group-tending of the child, adoption is not rare but is always dictated by some hard necessity or other, and once done, the new mother takes up an individual and exclusive position of maternity. I may add that all the scattered and mixed information which we receive under the headings of pregnancy, midwifery, childbirth and nursing habits from other parts of the world points to exactly the same conclusion * Individual motherhood is unquestionably founded in biological conditions—group-pregnancy, group-lactation and group-response have not been advocated even by extreme Morganians. But it has also full sociological confirmation as it appears in every human society. And this makes individual maternity into the corner-stone of kinship. In Melanesia, moreover, this relationship lasts right through life and plays a great sociological part in this matrilineal community. It also never

* Cf. Ploss-Bartels *Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerrunde*, eighth edition, 2 vols., 1905, and Ploss-Renz *Das Kind im Branch und Sitte der Völker*, 2 vols., 1911-1912. B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, 1913.

ceases to be a powerful sentiment, it never loses its unique personal nature. And Melanesia is the region where group-motherhood has been affirmed to exist!

When we pass to paternity matters become more involved and more dramatic, though not perhaps more difficult. We also begin here to tread beaten tracks. While maternity was practically banished from anthropology by either side in the grand dispute, paternity remained in the fore-ground. In fact the whole elaborate structures of Morgan and his followers are but variations upon the theme *pater sempe incertus*—variations or perhaps rather a fantasy! The classificatory terminologies which were the key to all Morgan's speculations revealed to him that the word father is applied to a group of people. This proved that a group of men must have been suspected of paternity, which again was a proof of group marriage. When later on Spencer and Gillen had discovered that there exist primitive tribes without the knowledge of physiological paternity, a discovery which I was able fully to confirm by my researches among a number of Melanesian tribes—matters became more complicated. The solution by Morgan's school, however, was found in the idea of a sociological paternity resulting from group marriage, and thus we were back again in the same position.

Let us have a look at facts, however. The first and most remarkable result of a careful survey is this: in most primitive societies the father stands emotionally, socially and practically in almost as near a relation to the child as the mother. This holds good in mother-right as well as in patriarchy, in communities where physiological fatherhood is unknown as in those in which it is over-emphasised, among lax people as among virtuous ones the father stands beside the mother at the child's cradle. I maintain that there must exist an instinctive or innate tendency on the part of a man to respond emotionally to a child born by the woman to whom he is united in every-day existence, over whose pregnancy he has kept guard and whose delivery has been made his concern. Such a trait in the human endowment would possess a great survival-value. My own observations in matrilineal as well as in patriarchal communities, have left me with a strong conviction that there is such an instinctive response. Data from other parts of the world corroborate fully this assumption.

But biology is not sufficient here either. Society steps in to supplement nature, to co-operate with the biological endowment, and to allow it full scope for expression. In all human societies, the father has to share even in the pregnancy taboos and to play a part in the pre-birth ceremonies. At birth, if he does not assume a very conspicuous part in one of the customs of the *couvade* type, he never remains an indifferent third party. Later on he is usually made to assist the mother or else to act in some way or other for the spiritual and material welfare of the baby. I have seen the Melanesian father acting the part of a nursery-maid with such excellent results that I could recommend him as a model for any home. Nor is the Melanesian father an exception in this. I could bring forward ample evidence from other parts of the world but a reference to Professor Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage* will suffice *

The most important point in which society goes hand in hand with nature as regards fatherhood is in the postulate of legitimacy. As you remember, we were able to pour full light upon this subject as regards our own special little plot of the world's savagery in Melanesia. Data, not only from this region, but also from other parts of the world—Polynesia, Western New Guinea, Australia, South America and Africa indicate that the combination of licence with legitimacy may be well-nigh universal. While freedom of sexual intercourse is generously allowed, freedom of pregnancy is absolutely denied.

The importance of this is great. It amounts to the declaration on the part of traditional law and morality that the existence of a child requires as its necessary condition the existence of a fully-fledged family, that a father is necessary as well as the mother, a natural male protector as well as a natural female nurse.

Fatherhood, moreover, does not end with the nursery. In the most pronounced matrilineal communities which I have studied the bond persists right through life, is on the sentimental side very much like the patriarchal relationship, containing more tenderness and less authority, but entailing a respect on the side of the younger and definite protective feelings on the part of the elder.

* Cf. Ploss-Bartels *Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerkunde*, eighth edition, 2 vols., 1905, and Ploss-Renz *Das Kind im Brauch und Sitte der Völker*, 2 vols., 1911-1912. B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, 1913.

As in the discussion of marriage so in that of family the greatest shortcoming of the usual anthropological treatment has been its failure to take into account human nature in the fullness of its aspects. A man-made science of man should be made to fit men and not marionettes. Affection, love, passion, the desire for happiness form the essence of those fundamental institutions of mankind, marriage, family and the regulation of sex. These apparently intangible elements can yet be correlated with empirical indices, and thus made objects of field-work and of scientific analysis. The greatest difficulty in anthropological studies consists in ensnaring the fugitive elements and imprisoning them into a scientifically valid formula. In no other subject is this difficulty so great as in the case of those institutions which tame man's most violent passions and transform them into the most enduring forces of social cohesion, into the loftiest moral ideals, and into the most serviceable activities.

With this we have arrived at the term of our survey of facts. Put into the simplest and baldest form, our conclusions merely vindicate the permanence and value of morality, marriage and family. Put more precisely they demonstrate that the family is the aim as well as the foundation of human kinship and society, that monogamous marriage is the only suitable means to this end, and that morality—with various forms of sexual license as an offset and a complement—is an inevitable condition at certain lower stages of society. The final generalisations of sober scientific enquiry appear very often as tame truisms. There is nothing sensational in them and they have a depressing flavour of common sense and mere reality. What I have laid down just now as to the correct conclusion looks very much like the Adam and Eve theory restated without even the redeeming background of Paradise and the sensational shock of the serpent. And yet in reality the knowledge over which with the help of anthropology we have command at present is entirely different from any belief in Paradisaical monogamy, Biblical patriarchy and its absolute unchangeable morals. Marriage is to us no more a supernaturally revealed institution. We have found that it is the natural outcome of man's biological constitution, working in conjunction with the laws of human society and of the human mind. The anthropologist need no more fall back upon this as a dogmatic belief. He knows and understands the workings of this institution,

he sees that it fulfils a universal need, above all, he comprehends its relation to the family and to sexual life. Monogamous marriage and individual parenthood we have seen to be but two aspects of the same fact of cardinal importance. With this also we found associated the economic and social independence of the household and a number of legal rules as to the counting of descent and regulation of duties and privileges. Marriage and family in the individual sense are the kernel of kinship, the foundations of law and custom and the nucleus of social organisation.

We have also gained an insight into the relation between the biological forces, social laws and psychological motives. Man is never governed by instinct alone, biology supplies the ends and outlines of human behaviour but the means are cultural, man-made and varying with society. The mere zoological vindication of human family is impossible. Even maternity is in man not a mere biological fact. The human family rests upon the fact that instincts are transformed into sentiments, and that this transformation is carried on within a moral atmosphere under the operation of a body of tribal law and within a scheme of material culture. But with all this the variations in human family and marriage, the various forms of mother-right and patriarchy, of polygamy, polyandry, avunculate and preliminary mating, however they might modify the superficial aspect of these institutions never fully obliterate their fundamental features: the selective choice of the two mates, the individual relationship in marriage and parenthood and the enduring, usually lifelong attachment.

It is not my purpose to develop, from the data given above, any definite schemes, but perhaps as an anthropologist I may be allowed to express a personal opinion on the practical bearings of this knowledge on modern problems.

If the family has always existed, if it is an indispensable part, nay the foundation of social structure at all levels of development, then in the first place, all theories, systems and reforms which in any way neglect this institution or even run counter to it, must be regarded as futile and deleterious. An organisation like the present Council, on the other hand, which makes the welfare of the family into the capital point of its programme will receive the full blessings of anthropology.

One apparent objection must be met in this connection. It might be urged, if the family is so inevitable why should we be

so concerned about it ? Why not leave it alone, and let it take care of itself—since it is bound to survive the worst shocks and to recover from the worst mutilations ! To this there is no answer on the dogmatic Adam and Eve doctrine of marriage. If marriage and family are made in Heaven let Heaven look after them. At any rate the discussion has to be shifted from the lecture room to the Church.

The scientific anthropological theory of the monogamous family is more useful. It teaches us that although monogamous family is real, it is not necessarily revealed ; though it is permanent, it is not always perfect ; though vital, it is yet plastic. An essentially human institution, it is subject to change, to deterioration as well as to improvement. Anthropology teaches us, therefore that at all stages there is the need of a constant struggle ; and the very existence of the monogamous family demands constant sacrifices, entails compromise and has to be bought at a considerable cost.

This price had often to be paid in far-reaching concessions to man's sexuality. I have dwelt upon this point with some detail, for the relation between sexual morality and marriage is perhaps the main concern of the present Council. And here again anthropology fully endorses the position taken up by this Society ; that is, that certain sexual tendencies are the main obstacle to the safety and prosperity of family and marriage. For we have seen with regard to the instinct of sex that its unquestionably promiscuous, or rather experimental components, require a great deal of readjustment in order to leave the family and monogamous marriage unimpaired.

The sexual instinct, in order to be selective, has to be powerful, enterprising and tending towards new experiences. At the same time in order to lead to permanent ties, this instinct must have a capacity of being transformed into a lasting sentiment of affection and love. One way in which we find this difficulty solved in human societies is by the satisfaction of the deeper tendency of the human character in the institution of monogamous marriage, and by the satisfaction of the experimental sexual impulse in extra-conjugal relations. Another way found also in primitive societies is by taming and repressing the empirical component in the sexual impulse.

Now the recognition that in savagery the broad avenue of pre-nuptial licence as well as the narrow path of continence and

virtue lead both to the same end, that of monogamous marriage, is theoretically of extreme interest and importance to the sociologist. It is also in a way comforting. But if we were to remain satisfied with this retrospective comfort, especially if we were to extend it to our present day conditions, anthropological knowledge would indeed have been wasted upon us. As a matter of fact the comparison of primæval licence with its modern counterparts shows us that they are essentially different. Licence in a small savage tribe is based on personal knowledge and selective preferences. Licence among us assumes as a rule an impersonal commercial aspect; it becomes almost always a form of prostitution. Among savages, though licence demands a heavy physiological toll, it does not lead necessarily to disease and crime. In our societies venereal disease—unknown to most primitive societies till, with other blessings of culture, it had been brought and given them by white man—crime, vice and perversion are the inevitable concomitant of extensive sexual laxity. This is the price we have to pay for our more highly differentiated nervous organisation. Among savages of the lax type the woman is not degraded to any greater extent than is man and no serious stain is left on the character or on the mentality of either. With us, just because we have to descend from a higher level of moral and mental culture, excess usually means permanent degradation of the woman and sometimes also of the man.

Thus, a comparison between savage and civilised communities might first of all deprive us of some of our racial conceit and teach us that unless we are a great deal better, we must regard ourselves as considerably worse than the most degraded savage.

Moreover, side by side with the lax peoples there exist and flourish essentially continent ones. The argument, therefore, that human nature needs prostitution, licence or some similar relief from the tedium of monogamous marriages is definitely disposed of by anthropological induction as well as by common sense, biology and the Bible. Anthropology impresses upon us, therefore, that the institutions of monogamous marriage, morality and family, though indispensable and inevitable, are yet subject to considerable variations as regards their constitution and function. They may be a great deal better or considerably worse. In any case they have to be maintained at a price of constant strife, fought within the individual, fought within the household,

fought above all in the public life of at least the more progressive human societies. As social conditions change the family and marriage have to become modified and re-adjusted. This requires knowledge, forethought and such organised work as the present Society undertakes to carry out.

Now we are living at present in a world of rapid change—not only of conditions, but also of ideas and ideals. A few years ago a small child might have been taken as the very symbol of innocence, to-day the hopeless prurency of the baby in arms has become an axiom of certain psychologists and if we are going to believe them we might as well organise a Society for the Protection of Parents from Infantile Moral Contamination. But in spite of exaggeration, the fact is undeniable that the instinct of sex, or rather, some of its most undesirable components, awaken much earlier than was accepted until lately. I have dwelt upon the unsavoury topic of infantile sexuality among a number of savage races to show that anthropology at this point fully endorses the verdict of competent mental research. On this point the practical conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that a sound attitude in sexual matters must be built up from infancy, that a conscious guidance by the parents, a gradual and rational enlightenment and an intelligent control must replace the older system of ignoring, pooh-poohing and repressive punishment.

The life of boys and girls before, during and after adolescence is also rapidly changing. Co-education in the schools, common work in the factory, in the office or at a University, bring the two sexes together, allow for a much better knowledge and mutual confidence and prepare people for sexual mating. The conditions of the future will give the middle classes of Western Europe the same opportunity of knowledge through common work, which the peasant communities and most savages had in the past.

Anthropological experience shows that there are two, and only two solutions in that case—sexual laxity or early marriage. Of these two alternatives there is hardly any doubt as to which a sociologist or hygienist should choose.

Continence may be advocated in two ways; we either can belittle the value of sex, try to disprove the necessity of a full life of instinct and of satisfied desire and press the virtues of chastity and asceticism. Anthropology, if invited to preach such a gospel would have to remain silent. The science of man is led from

biological considerations to the conclusion that the exercise of all instincts is good for the human organism; sociologically it regards celibacy as at best a necessary evil. Morally, anthropology insists on the fullness of life for man and woman.

But there is another way of promoting temporary continence, above all, continence at a time when the organism is being formed. This is to be gained not by denying but by affirming the value and beauty of sexual life, not by preaching barren continence, but by revealing that the full attainment of sexual satisfaction cannot be realised except in a permanent union of deep love and mutual sacrifice. Such a propaganda is in concrete words the propaganda for early marriages. The economic obstacles, the social and psychological considerations which until recently formed serious objections against youthful matrimony have vanished, or are rapidly vanishing. The use of contraceptives, against which I personally cannot see any objection, biological, social or moral, does free early marriages from the economic burden of too hasty reproduction. Better mutual knowledge at school and at work qualifies the two partners for a more competent choice. Finally, easier divorce, which in my opinion is one of the indispensable reforms in any programme of social hygiene propaganda, will reduce the dreadful finality of the marriage bond, which deters many people from it, and is thus inevitably the source of a great deal of immorality. Anthropology has shown us clearly that a good family is impossible without a happy marriage. Easier divorce, by mutual consent above all, is an inevitable condition of sound family life in the present time, when the thirst for personal happiness, for independence and for self-realisation surround irrevocable unions with a certain amount of terror.

Unless reasonable divorce is made easier than it is at present, there is no doubt that under the actual conditions—the economic independence of woman, her intellect, initiative and her greater self-assertion—many a man and woman would prefer to enter into a free union rather than bind themselves to ties which might prove fatal to their liberty and happiness. The question of what moral or scientific attitude the Council might adopt towards the problem of such free unions I shall leave unanswered, though it is important to raise it.

I suggest that it would be salutary for purpose of discussion, propaganda and reform, that such a condition of free unions should

be sharply discriminated from other types of laxity. It seems to me that the word ' promiscuity ' is used too indiscriminately to cover everything which is not monogamy. Such lax terminology is deplorable, for laxity is bad in thinking as well as in morals. There is an enormous difference from all points of view between on the one hand a permanent union based upon love and upon the acceptance of mutual burdens and responsibilities, and on the other, prostitution, a mercenary liaison, or even frivolous mating for the mere satisfaction of lust. I certainly do not advocate free unions, since I believe that the right solution lies in early marriages : I only suggest that they are infinitely less unhealthy, immoral and socially deleterious than prostitution or sexual frivolity. I also am convinced that unless early marriages are made the standard of matrimonial mating, and unless their bonds are made less galling by an easier divorce, anthropology seems to indicate that there is some danger of free unions. Whether this danger should be met by moral disapproval on the part of a scientific body or by a slightly changed moral attitude is a problem which should be posed if not solved. I suggest also that the present moral tone which in all sexual irregularity penalises the woman rather than the man and the offspring rather than the parents, is akin to the morality of the lewdest and lowest savages. Woman has become the equal of man and while we expect from her as much as from him it would be ignoble to degrade her for a line of conduct in which she risks more, suffers incomparably more and alone achieves a socially great result—the birth of a child.

I am afraid that I have allowed my moral zeal to carry me far beyond the limits which my present task warrants. Anthropology can teach us in all these matters but the first principles and fundamental points. These, in a nutshell, amount to the affirmation that man is neither inevitably promiscuous nor naturally monogamous. There is an experimental component in sexual desire leading towards new sexual interests, new conquests and experiences. There is, on the other hand, a deep desire to keep the beloved one and to remain faithful to him or to her. Anthropology teaches us also that besides the endowment of nature the influence of nurture, too, is immense. It teaches us that a high ideal can be attained, but that this ideal must not be divorced from reality, that all theories and plans must take account of past history and even more of present

conditions To work for a full development of the sexual instinct for a full attainment of passionate love in an exclusive union for life is a beautiful ideal and a great reality To preach the negative attitude of continence at all costs and to indulge in the mere denial of the importance of sex or to live in the Fool's Paradise that "all is for the best in the best of unsexed worlds," is not scientifically sound It is evident then that anthropology is a vigorous supporter of all schemes and plans which lead to the strengthening of monogamous marriage and of the individual family. On the other hand no student of man can be an absolute follower of Mrs Grundy—she has never studied anthropology

In conclusion I think it has become quite clear that no satisfactory knowledge of the institutions which the social reformer is trying to control or improve can be acquired without anthropological study. I think also that a glance from afar upon our own conditions, ideas and institutions such as we can obtain by dwelling for some time mentally among savages clears our vision and broadens our mind I should like to add that although the reformer may benefit by the study of anthropological science the anthropologist, on the other hand, is bound to benefit also from the collaboration For so far nothing has been a greater bane upon our science than the idle antiquarian interest by which it has been primarily inspired. And although every type of research would deteriorate by letting itself be pinned down to narrow utilitarian purposes yet nothing can inspire and fertilise human thought as well as a touch of reality, and the essence of reality lies in action and in the practical concern with the future.

THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION AND TRADITION IN SOCIAL HYGIENE.

By T PERCY NUNN, M A , D.Sc.,
Professor of Education in the University of London.

IN the title of this address two things—education and tradition—are brought together, and it must be an important part of my purpose to consider how they are related. In the first place let us be clear as to the sense in which we are to use the word tradition. There is a tradition connecting Ludgate Hill with an ancient King Lud, a tradition that Dr Johnson used to occupy, as a throne, a particular chair at the *Cheshire Cheese* hard by. This is not the meaning the term is to carry in our argument. We shall use it to refer to such social facts as the English system of Parliamentary government which at once expresses and maintains a persistent or only slowly changing political habit and outlook, our legal institutions, which are, equally with our political, a part or an organ of the historic life of the nation, the scientific and technical knowledge, the skill and the ideals of conduct and workmanship transmitted from one generation to another by professional men, artists and craftsmen, and those who engage in finance, industry and commerce. In short, we shall mean by it a great part of what some writers speak of as “our social heritage.” In a book with that title Professor Graham Wallas has drawn a picture, fortunately of great improbability, which throws into vivid relief the main points I wish to be conveyed when I speak of traditions—namely, that they are historic or secular modes of human activity, intellectual, practical, æsthetic, which constitute the very tissue of a people’s life.

“If the earth were struck,” he writes, “by one of Mr. Wells’s comets, and if, in consequence, every human being now alive were to lose all knowledge and habits he had acquired from preceding generations, . . . nine-tenths of the inhabitants of London or New York would be dead in a month, and 99 per cent of the remaining tenth would be dead in six months. They would have no language to express their thoughts, and no thoughts but vague

reverse, . . . Even in the country districts men could not invent, in time to save their lives, methods of growing food, or taming animals, or making fire, or so clothing themselves as to endure a northern winter . . . The white races would probably become extinct everywhere. A few primitive races might live on fruit and small animals in those fertile tropical regions where the human species was originally evolved until they had slowly accumulated a new social heritage”*

Now many of the traditions that would be lost in such a tragedy may be said to be educative, in the sense that they influence powerfully the minds and characters of those drawn into them. Common observation and experience have given us all concepts, sharpened and enriched by literary pictures, of the contrasted types of the farmer and the lawyer, the naval and the medical man, the parson, the artist, the manufacturer, the schoolmaster and a hundred others. We know well that all the older and more clearly defined occupations stamp in a characteristic way the men and women who pursue them; that some of them tend to produce a peculiar outlook upon life, and that many of them generate a distinctive *ethos* as well as fostering distinctive intellectual habits. But by education we shall mean here not the mere fact that all minds and characters are inevitably subdued by what they work in; we shall employ the word, in its usual narrower sense, to signify adult action deliberately directed to the training of the young.

Nevertheless, the more clearly we understand the proper nature of education the more clearly shall we see that the notion of tradition is relevant to it. The proper aim of education is to fit our children to carry on efficiently and worthily those traditions which, as I have said, form the persistent tissue of social and national life. In his home a child should learn the traditions of decency, of good manners, of elementary morals; his school should teach him the traditions of industry, of co-operation in social service. In addition we expect schools to impart the broader kinds of knowledge and skill that form the general basis of the traditional specialised activities of adult life, and to give their pupils a sympathetic understanding of the great “cultural” traditions, such as literature, science and the arts. Regarding edu-

* *Our Social Heritage*. (1920), p 18

cation in this way, we place ourselves, I would urge, at the right point of view for seeing how a school should carry on its work. We are prone to make education an abstract, and therefore a relatively unfruitful business, by treating it as if it should consist merely in the communication of knowledge and inculcation of "mental discipline" If we always thought of it and practised it as an initiation of the young into the basal traditions of civilised life, and conceived those traditions concretely and dynamically as modes of activity, it would become a much more profitable thing both to the individual scholar and the nation.

But though the most important work of education is to preserve the continuity and to widen the influence of the traditions that have played the greatest part in shaping the civilisation we have inherited, its functions do not end here. Wise men have always recognised that the school is the best means of restoring the life of a dead or dying tradition. An impressive modern instance is the founding of a school at Gradovo in 1835—an event which led more directly than any other to the revival of the national consciousness of the Bulgarians and the emergence of that tough little people into the turbulent life of Eastern Europe. We have seen the same process on a smaller scale in the institution of "manual training centres" to save from extinction the weakening tradition of English craftsmanship, and in Cecil Sharp's devoted—and we may hope successful efforts to revive our national folk songs and dances.

Again, the leaders of a people naturally seek the help of the schools when they judge, rightly or wrongly, that it is desirable to change the orientation of the national mind, to modify its old traditions, or to permeate it with new ones. Thus, thanks to T. H. Huxley and other pioneers, the tradition of scientific thought and activity, which has, since the Renaissance, increasingly affected the lives and happiness of men, is, through scientific teaching in schools, slowly changing the temper and attitude of the popular mind. And we have seen in the history of Prussia since Jena, and the transformation of Japan, instances of the same kind of process on a gigantic scale. When we consider the tremendous effects education, clearly directed and energetically maintained, has produced in these cases, we can understand, if we cannot wholly share, the flamboyant optimism of Benjamin Kidd, who held that the schools could in twenty-five years expel

from the mind of Europe the age-long tradition of international hostility

You will, I hope, discern without difficulty the bearing of these observations upon the problems of social hygiene. An important—perhaps the most important—part of our task is to foster—perhaps to create—a new tradition, definite and vigorous enough and sufficiently pervasive to influence powerfully the whole life of the nation. Let us review briefly the conditions which the accomplishment of this task presupposes, and then proceed, guided by the foregoing ideas, to consider how it should be attacked.

In the first place there must, of course, be at the disposal of the community the best physiological, medical and general hygienic knowledge of the day, and that knowledge must constantly be increased by relevant research. There must also be a proper provision of such institutions as the medical inspection of school children, medical and dental clinics, and so on. We may add here the removal of conditions, such as bad and insufficient housing, which make a “health conscience” a luxury inaccessible to a large part of the population. These are all matters that require corporate action by the community, but do not belong immediately to the province of education. But although the most admirable things may be done under the heads I have indicated, their value must be largely lost unless the work of specialists and administrators is met by popular knowledge sufficient to understand it and to sympathise with it. Above all, the people at large must be brought under the influence of enlightened hygienic ideals, and be given some vision of what the physical life might be, and some sense of its value.

It is here that education must enter the field, and there are two points at which it may take up its special task. Something may be said for the view that all education that aims directly at social reform should start with the adult generation, if only because teaching given to school children is not likely to produce much result if it collides with the prejudices and practices which prevail in their homes. Adult education in social hygiene is, therefore, important if only to create an atmosphere in which the labours of the school may come to fruit. Moreover, in directing the attention of adults to questions of social hygiene one may appeal to parental instinct and to some experience of the miseries

that flow from ill-health, bad heredity, unfavourable conditions of home life, and vicious behaviour. All this is very obvious, but it is equally obvious that under present conditions adult education in social hygiene can reach effectively only a small fraction of the people, the main line of advance must necessarily lie elsewhere.

It is in the schools of the country that the foundations of a sound tradition of social hygiene must be established. Chiefly through the persistent pressure of the Board of Education much useful teaching in personal hygiene is now given in the elementary schools, but in the great field of secondary education far too little has been done. The easy answer to this criticism is that in the secondary schools teaching in hygiene is little needed. For even the poorest scholars learn there by imitation and social pressure our middle-class standards of healthy living, and the cult of games and other open-air activities gives girls as well as boys a respect for a sound physique which no formal lessons could inspire. But for several reasons the reply is not so adequate as it sounds—the reason most germane to our discussion being that a preference for open windows and an admiration for excellence in games will not of themselves produce the enlightened ideal of physical life which we desire to see dominant and active throughout the nation. To gain that end we must relate our teaching in hygiene and our love of sports to a wider and deeper interest—an interest at once intellectual, aesthetic and moral, in physical life as such. In an eloquent passage of a profound book Mr Benchara Branford has shown how grievously England has suffered in respect both of the wisdom of her national policy and the quality of her general life since she ceased during the nineteenth century to be a people “to whom nature was life even more than mechanism.” We have become, he says—and surely with truth—“mesmerised by the machine process,” so that “machinery has too commonly inspired our polity in all its ramifications, secular and sacred.” This unfortunate bias in the national outlook is reflected only too clearly in the curriculum of our schools and the class-rooms of our universities. In our secondary schools for boys “science” means scarcely anything beyond physics and chemistry, and we rightly hesitate to apply that grave name to the “nature study” with which we entertain the little fellows who are not yet old

enough for the real thing. In the girls' schools things are only apparently better for the prevalence there of botany is due more to the Victorian idea of its suitability to the feminine mind than to any belief in the national importance of biological studies as such. My conviction is, and has long been, that progress towards national enlightenment in social hygiene must remain slow and disappointing until we rectify these grave defects in our school programmes. We must seek through genuine, if simple, biological teaching in the elementary and even more in the secondary schools to correct the orientation of the national mind, and health instruction, ceasing to take the relatively unfruitful form of arguments and rules *ad hoc*, must grow naturally out of studies aimed at the understanding and appreciation of life in all its forms.*

To pronounce upon the way in which the biological sciences should be taught is beyond my competence, but I venture at some risk to press one consideration upon your notice. Giovanni Gentile, the eminent philosopher, who is now minister of Public Instruction in Italy, has pointed out how much lasting harm resulted from the depreciation of the body and its activities which emerged, rather as an historical accident than as an essential feature of religious doctrine, during the early development of Christianity †. I do not share Professor Gentile's philosophic standpoint, but I subscribe whole-heartedly to his view that the antithesis between the spiritual and the bodily has been pressed to indefensible and dangerous conclusions, and that we need to return towards the saner Greek ideal which recognised no opposition between spiritual excellence and the beauty and wholesomeness of the physical life. The early Christian attitude, which came about as a natural reaction to certain evils in paganism, was fixed upon the modern mind by the trend of philosophy since the Renaissance for the dialectic of Descartes sundered body and soul so completely that neither philosophers nor men of science have been able to bring them together again. There is of course no question that immense good has followed from the patient analysis of the physical and chemical factors involved in the almost infinite com-

* The same point is urged in an excellent chapter (ch ix) of Sir George Newman's recent report "The Health of the School Child."

† *The Reform of Education* (Eng trans, 1923), ch ix

plexity of the physical organism, and to deprecate scientific research of this kind would be as childish as it would be harmful if it could succeed in its purpose. Yet an analysis which, the further it penetrates, leaves less room for, and renders still more inscrutable, those elements that give life its distinctive character and value cannot, one feels, have the last word. Although a layman in biology, I venture therefore to hail what is, I believe, a growing tendency among biologists to reaffirm the essential solidarity between the manifestations of life at all its levels—to recognise that there is more than mechanism in the body, and that mind is not ‘epi-phenomenon,’ but a character which somehow pervades the organism as a whole. And I believe that in this tendency may be discerned one of the most hopeful bases of a sound and noble tradition of social hygiene.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME IN SOCIAL HYGIENE.

By WINIFRED CULLIS, O B.E., D Sc.,
Professor of Physiology, University of London.

No doubt every lecturer in this series has said that his aspect of the subject was the most difficult. He may have thought that was so, but I *know* that mine is, because it is such a self-evident proposition, and with a proposition that is self-evident, it is extraordinarily difficult to get up and say about it anything that is worth saying. It is as if one were asked to prove that it was a necessity to eat to live, that is a subject on which everyone is informed by experience, and this question of the influence of the home in social hygiene is again a subject on which everyone is informed. Each of you here, I am sure, could make a contribution to this general discussion as valuable as the one that I can make. You would each take it from a different angle, and from each of these angles it would be extraordinarily interesting. The angle from which I feel, perhaps, justified to speak is the physiological angle, and I wish rather to stress that point of view—not because I think it is the only point of view, but because that is the one that touches most nearly on my own experience.

If we consider the family as a factor in the production of a right attitude of mind, we realise there is no factor so important in creating public opinion and in setting up standards of public behaviour as the home. I propose to say very little to you about the home as a place in which we all live. From the point of view of this particular question I wish to stress rather the home as the place in which the children receive their early education, and in which a large number of their most permanent impressions are to be formed; and in speaking of the home, it is very difficult indeed to avoid platitudes, because the factors that are essential for the making of a home are, again, the ones most of us are agreed upon. We must, for instance, if we are going to have a satisfactory home, tackle the great housing problem; we cannot have a satisfactory home unless we have a satisfactory

place for that home—and I want you to realise the difference between “satisfactory” and ‘happy,’ because one knows that there are many thousands of thousands of people who have achieved the making of *happy* homes, even though they have had to do it under the most adverse conditions, and one would like to pay a tribute to those who have achieved that very great thing, the making of a happy home under the most difficult and unfavourable circumstances. But that is no reason why we should be content to sit by and see them have to make these great efforts, and that is why we must work for better housing conditions, whilst realising that a great deal of happiness has come from extraordinarily poor homes.

In the same way, there must be a living wage if people are going to have the kind of home we want them to have. These two factors are very essential in the making of satisfactory homes and in maintaining individual self-respect, and I think we shall all be agreed that, again, these factors are extraordinarily important in producing the right standard of general public behaviour.

To come back to a consideration of the home as the place for the upbringing of a child. I think most of us here are agreed that the normal home is the proper place for the bringing up of children. There are some who feel that when they consider the unsatisfactory homes of those children, it might perhaps be better that they should be brought up in institutions, but that must be the exception, and I am convinced, as I am sure most of you are convinced, that the happiest individual and the one with the best chance is the child who is brought up in a good home. I do not in the least mean to say that one does not understand the sadness and the unhappiness that comes from living in a bad home and under tyrannical conditions, but we are trying to imagine that we are going to get a good home, and if we make the material circumstances good, in many cases we shall, I think, help to do away with some of the difficulties that stand in the way of the achievement of that ideal.

As to the question of the upbringing of a child, there again one must come on to a platitude. I feel most of the time one only wants to stand up and say—“Of course, the home is the most important thing”—and then, after a little while—“Well, the most important factor in the upbringing of a child is the home”;

but it is not any good to repeat that over and over again, so we must consider for a few moments what are the factors in the upbringing of a child which are particularly in the hands of the home. You will remember the statement of a very famous priest, that if he had a child for the first five years of its life he was practically assured that he had the child for the whole of its life. It is another way of saying that the most important years in the education of that extraordinarily plastic material, the human being, the most important years are these first years. Those years are normally in the hands of the parents, and, of course, of the brothers and sisters, who contribute very largely, in many cases—certainly on the educational and disciplinary side—to the upbringing of the child. For the development of standards in a child, I think the essential thing is that there must be good standards upheld by the parents. The responsibility of bringing up a child always seems to me to be one of those responsibilities in regard to which we might quite truly use the word “awful.” It is truly a great and wonderful responsibility, but I suppose it is one that parents do get used to, or else they would never take it so cheerfully and so successfully as they do; but as one who has not had to bring up a child, it always seems to me that it is one of the greatest and most responsible tasks that can be laid upon any human being.

On the question of education we have something to say, I think, from the physiological point of view, because one of the great factors of this early education is *habit formation*, and the formation of habits belongs very much to those early years of life, and a habit is, perhaps, not very far removed from what the physiologists call a reflex action. You may remember that for the performance of a reflex action certain essential conditions must be fulfilled. We must have a stimulus starting at some part of the body—an afferent path by means of which that stimulus is taken to the central nervous system, where the impulse is passed on in the case of a simple action to a nerve cell, or in the case of a series of complex actions it is passed on by what we call collateral processes to a very large number of other nerve cells. Those cells take the impulse that has been brought to them—the afferent impulse—and send it out along another fibre—the efferent fibre—to the effector apparatus. That is the path necessary for the action that we call a “reflex,” and, as opposed to a “voluntary”

action, it is one that takes place as the result of some stimulus, without the intervention of actual consciousness or volitional impulses. These reflex powers are very largely developed in the early years of life, they are the basis of every action that we perform in the body. In the act of walking we carry out an immense number of these reflexes, involving the conversion of afferent stimuli into efferent or motor response. I often think it is a great pity that we cannot remember what we felt like the first time we stood alone, because it is a most magnificent achievement—the successful balancing up of hundreds of muscles in the body, after a very large number of unsuccessful attempts. When we watch a baby who has just achieved the act of pulling himself up in his cot, I always feel it is a look of triumph we notice on his face, and if we could remember it, I expect it would be one of the really satisfactory moments of our lives when we were able to do that for ourselves.

That has meant the training and co-ordination of all these reflex powers, and the bringing of them together, and undoubtedly the basis of all habits is the facilitation of the paths in the central nervous system so that very little resistance is offered and the act is performed with great ease. Most of the reflexes of the body are of the kind that we call protective. Darwin showed us the force of this protective instinct, and how little it can be governed by a conscious volitional effort, in a study of one of the powerful protective reflexes—the instinctive moving back of the head, or the closing of the eyes, if any dangerous object approaches the face. He went into the Snake House at the Zoological Garden, and put his face against a case containing a poisonous variety of snake and irritated it so that the snake should come towards him and strike the glass where his face was. He tried that experiment over and over again, but he never could manage to keep his face down, though he knew perfectly well that there was a $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch plate glass between him and the snake and it was impossible for it to touch him. That is an illustration of the extraordinary force of these automatic actions—these reflex actions. There is no doubt that the repetition of actions which tends to make them automatic or reflex is the basis of the formation of habits and it is, therefore, extraordinarily important that the first habits laid down should be good ones, we want to build wisely at the beginning. It has often seemed to me that it is

rather like the difference between irregular growth of a town and a town that is growing up under what we may call a town-planning scheme. So often a town is developed in certain ways that eventually turn out to be rather inconvenient, and then—as we know in this city of ours—it is extraordinarily difficult to undo what has been done, it is also extraordinarily difficult in the case of habit formation to undo what has been done. Therefore, it is so much easier for the individual if at the beginning good habits are laid down and are encouraged. It is very difficult to know how to train a child in the right habits, but it is a subject that really needs consideration, and I think that the British Social Hygiene Council will be doing a very good thing if it helps young parents to consider that aspect of education and is able to give them advice and help them tide over some of their many difficulties.

There is no question that the splendid work that has been done by various Government departments in connection with Child Welfare has made a very great difference to the physical start of the children of this nation. My father, who is a man of eighty-three, and a scientific person, always trained to observe, says that, as an old man, the thing that strikes him as most remarkable at the present time is the beauty of the babies—and he is convinced that these fine and lovely children are better developed than the majority were when he was a young man. I think we owe that very largely to the Infant Welfare movement, and it is a great accomplishment. We have got past the days when we used to hear how the people resented this help and the mothers objected. We have all heard the old story of the mother who said: “You can’t teach me anything, I know all about children; I have had 11 and buried 9.” The person who had had a large number of children, and therefore a large experience of them, was convinced she could not be taught anything about children, particularly by some young female person who had had no children and couldn’t possibly know about the upbringing of children, and those of us who are not married always feel very nervous in addressing people with children on the subject of their education. I think we all agree with these mothers that experience is most valuable, but do you not feel also that there is help that can be given to the parents by those who have made a scientific study of such points as habit formation? How are you going to make a child learn good”

habits—do certain things ? I suppose it depends a good deal on the temperament of the individual. Are you going to use persuasion or coercion ? That is a very difficult problem about which to come to a right decision, and I feel a lot of help could be given to the parents in regard to it. I think parents do realise now that, in view of the big task they are called upon to perform, it is not to their discredit, but rather to their credit, that they should desire to get this help in learning how to bring up their children. A friend of mine told me of a young woman who was going to have her first child, and confided in her that she felt very alarmed about it, from the point of view of the responsibility it meant. She said, ‘ Supposing it gets something wrong with it, how shall I know what to do ’ ” My friend told her of various ways in which to get information, and the young woman said, “ I didn’t get much help from my mother, she didn’t think I ought to ask these questions so soon. She said, in rather a shocked tone, ‘ My dear, all that knowledge will come to you when the child is born ’ ” Unfortunately, that is not true. There is a great deal of knowledge that has to be acquired, sometimes at the expense of the experience of the parents and of the child, but I think we can help to prevent some of the anxieties that the parents must naturally feel. Many of you, no doubt, know of the very big movement in the States at the present time for the study of the actual psychology of the child, and one of the great movements there is the study of what they call the “ pre-school ” child. I met in Geneva, when I was attending the International Congress of Child Welfare, a woman who was at the head of one of these schools, and she told us a great deal about its work. I do not think I have ever heard more fascinating stories than those she told us about the habits and behaviour of these children, ranging from two to five years, in that school, they were absolutely thrilling, and made one realise that a very great deal indeed can be got out of a systematic study of the children at that age. That is the kind of thing we hope such bodies as the British Social Hygiene Council will be able to do and to pass on to the parents the results of such study.

Then, in connection with education, there is yet another aspect—another way in which we may look at the question from the physiological aspect. I expect many of you have heard about the work of one of our greatest living scientists, Professor Pavlov—

a Russian physiologist. He came over to Edinburgh to the International Physiological Congress two years ago. He is a man over eighty, and I think at that conference he made the most brilliant and the most original contribution that was made throughout the whole of that International Congress, which I think is a remarkable achievement at that age, and is evidence in favour of the view expressed by Sir Arthur Keith that one way to keep young is to develop the habit of learning and keep it up. Professor Pavlov has studied very extensively the action of the digestive glands, and in connection with them has given us a great deal of knowledge, some of which is certainly very acceptable, such as his proof that appetite is a very important factor in digestion, and that it is extremely helpful to give people the food that they like. The old idea was that if you gave people food that they didn't like it was probably the food that was good for them. Now Professor Pavlov says that if we give people food that they really so much dislike that they react to it, they may actually keep that food in their alimentary canal for prolonged periods with very little digestive action, whereas if they have food that they like, immediately their digestive glands start their work and pour out the digestive juices and there is an extremely good and satisfactory digestion. He also taught us what harmful effects on digestion can be caused by emotions, particularly bad temper. X-ray photographs show us that an individual may have all the process of digestion interfered with by a fit of bad temper. The moral is that you must have pleasant company at your dinner table, and if you are going to quarrel in the family, do not do it at meal-times, because it will have a disastrous effect upon the digestion.

In connection with this work, Professor Pavlov told us of a special group of reflexes which he called "conditioned" reflexes, and which, he said, could be established as a result of training. The one he quoted to us in Edinburgh I do not think was quite borne out by later experiments, though one hoped it would be, because it was rather attractive. He demonstrated that you can make animals, and ourselves equally, respond with a secretion of the digestive juices that will help digestion to any stimulus provided you associate that stimulus with gratification of the appetite. We have a very definite one in an ordinary household: when we are going to have dinner a gong usually sounds,

and at that sound our gastric juice is poured out in preparation for the meal. Professor Pavlov showed that he could train mice by connecting feeding with the sound of a gong, so that when they heard the dinner gong the gastric juice poured out and they were just in the condition to get the best out of their meal. Such a reflex is a "conditioned reflex" He said that he had found that with the first generation this "conditioned" reflex—for obviously it is not an inborn reflex—was effective after 100 times hearing of the gong and being fed immediately afterwards, the offspring of those mice secreted their gastric juice after they had heard the bell 50 times; their grandchildren after 30 times, and the next generation after 10 times; and he told us he confidently hoped that the last group—born while he was away—would secrete their gastric juice the moment they heard the first bell! By associated stimulus and feeding an animal can be trained to respond and *appreciate* a stimulus which at the beginning is actually unpleasant, *i e*, a stimulus which is not liked at first can be converted into a very welcome stimulus if always associated with feeding—and become a stimulus that is received with a sense of gratification and pleasure. I always feel there is a very good moral about that, because it may be that we have the same sort of effect produced in ourselves when we try to do things which are hard, which are difficult, but which, at the end, if persevered with, give us a sense of achievement. And may it not be that if we encourage children to do things which are hard and difficult for them, provided they can get that sense of achievement, at the end we shall have given them a habit, the habit of overcoming difficulties, which is going to stand them in very good stead in after life, when things do not come quite so easily to us. That is one of the many instances in which it seems to me we can get a sermon from a physiological text. Physiology is extraordinarily moral, and nearly all the happenings of the body can provide such texts. The inference here is that in the education of children we should try, as far as possible, to help them to lay down paths of habit, such that the well-worn path, and therefore the easy path, is the path that is the desirable path, and not allow them to set up for themselves easy paths which are bad paths and which are going to give great trouble in later life, if those paths have to be, so to speak, uprooted.

In studying the development of the central nervous system we find that one of the fundamental physiological features of habit formation lies in the making of tracts of association. We want to develop the right tracts of association: we can do it perfectly well if we take sufficient pains and trouble with the education. To show you that these association tracts really do get laid down in learning, we will take the instance that, for some reason or another, seems to come to the mind of every psychologist as an illustration in this connection, viz, the word "mouse." On hearing the word "mouse," think of the different parts of the brain that are set in activity in any one of your minds. You have at once a series of conceptions. You know what it sounds like—the word itself; you know what it looks like when it is printed, you know what it looks like when you write it yourself. Each of these conceptions occupies a separate centre; there is the auditory centre, the visualisation centre, the hand centre, associated with it. Then you have the association of the object itself, you can think, either with shrinking or liking, of the actual little animal, you can think of the feel of its little, warm, soft body, with its very rapidly beating heart. You have the visual, the tactile, the olfactory, the auditory sensations—all these centres stirred up by that one small word, and they are all associated together to give you this conception of a "mouse." It is the same with all education—the children learn by association, and we can see to it that they put together things that are rightly associated. It is a question of planning out the education of the child.

In connection with these questions, there is one other point that ought to be mentioned, and that is the part played, in these complex actions we perform, by another mechanism of very great physiological significance and importance, and that is INHIBITION. Inhibition is essential for the effective carrying out of any action in the body, as was shown by Sir Charles Sherrington, one of our greatest living physiologists, to whom we owe the real understanding of this important mechanism, without which no voluntary movements can be brought about. To take as an illustration, a very common movement, the bending of the arm. To bring about this movement a whole series of impulses travelling along associated tracts are set in play, and immediately all those muscles that bring

about flexion are contracted to an appropriate degree, and those that would interfere with their complete action are not only not contracted but are actually relaxed or inhibited. In the body we usually keep all our muscles in a state of "tone," *i.e.*, just on the verge of activity, or just ready to contract and so to carry out a really effective action there must always be accompanying the *contraction* of the muscles involved in the actual movement, the removal of this small tonic contraction from the antagonistic muscles or as it is called relaxation or "inhibition" of these muscles. This is carried out by means of what is called "reciprocal innervation" and shows that inhibition is an essential feature of all muscular action.

It is necessary to stress this since many people think inhibitions are wrong, and a great many psychologists will tell you that inhibitions are dangerous, but I think it cannot be so, because inhibition is physiologically essential, and we cannot carry out the simplest movement of the body without inhibitions. It is a question of applying inhibitions correctly.

Then in connection with education, may I mention another point, which I am afraid may seem to you not quite in the line of thought that we have been following, but one which nevertheless, is important from a general point of view, and that is that parents should not be *over* careful with their children. It is one of the most important factors in the proper development of any individual child that it should be brought up in an atmosphere of care and attention and love, and a man was saying to me only to-day that children whose parents are in India often suffer a deficiency in that respect, because, however much the people who look after them may care for them, it is not quite the same thing; they have not the feeling that they have a *right* to the love, and that is one of the delightful feelings associated with the love of parents. Children do not have to consider it, they just breathe it in. But there is undoubtedly a danger that anyone who has the responsibility of looking after children may so easily feel they cannot bear to have those children run risks. Indeed, one wonders how any mothers stand the shocks that all mothers get—the accidents, the falls, the cuts, the illnesses—always a fresh shock being delivered to the poor, unfortunate parent in the home. But, *in spite* of that, I think the parents must realise that it is most important to make their children independent; they must learn

to do without that great care. One sees the lack of it sometimes in the people who come to the universities—those who have not been educated to mix with their fellows, who have been kept at home too much. Such people lose a very great deal out of their university life. This may seem a very isolated point to bring up, but I do think it is very important that children should be trained to be independent, to be able to look after themselves and be able to mix with their fellows. You know how those who cannot do this shut up in face of a little unfavourable criticism or in any unfavourable environment. You must teach children to stand up against these things, and how much easier it is for them to learn to stand against difficulties and criticism whilst they are still in their homes.

Another small point that still is important. Young people generally should be taught how to spend money, with a definite sense of its value, otherwise, they grow up into young adult life very far from having a proper conception of what can or what cannot be done with money. They have the feeling that things just *come*; they do not know what things cost. A friend of mine told me that when he married he started in a rather more extravagant way than he should have done, and when he was feeling at the end of his first year that matters were going to be a little difficult, he got a message from the bank to say his personal account (he and his wife were drawing on the same account) was overdrawn £200. That, on top of everything else, was an awful shock. When he spoke to his wife about it she said it couldn't possibly be so; she was sure it was a mistake, because she had quite a lot of cheques still left in her cheque book! So I think, perhaps, it is just as well to let people have cheque books and balance their own accounts at quite an early age, if they are going to have bank accounts to manage.

Returning to the question of education, there is one other aspect which is of importance, the teaching of sex hygiene, and I feel very strongly that should be a part of the home education of the child. As I have said so many times, my own view is that the proper persons to teach the elementary knowledge, in the first place, are the parents. It is a difficulty for many parents, but one they ought to face, and one in which they can get help and advice from books and people. The teaching can be done much more easily if it is first tackled when the children

are quite young. It is easier to answer the questions simply and truthfully in those days, and again I beg of anyone who has any influence in this matter to see to it that children are never deceived by their parents about this. If parents do not want to tell the children let them say so to them, but do not tell them untruths, for it breaks down a child's faith if he finds he has been deliberately deceived. Some people are afraid that talking of it is going to make the children think a lot about it. I assure you it is quite the reverse. If children are told about it quite naturally when they ask about it, it sinks in amongst the thousands of things that they are being told about and are learning all the time, whereas, if there is one thing they mustn't ask about, immediately their minds are inclined to dwell on it. They think there must be something very queer about it if they mustn't ask questions about it, whereas if the question is asked and answered and they have the information given them, it will cease to occupy a prominent position in their thoughts. I think parents should see that children are educated in three stages. First, when they are very young, they should be told very simply the facts that are suitable for the young child to know; then, at or before adolescence, they should be told the facts that will force themselves on to them at the period of puberty, which, if they come without any warning, are very often extraordinarily disturbing and alarming, both to boys and to girls. It would be very difficult for a parent to start talking about these things at the stage of adolescence if nothing had been said before—I can imagine it being almost impossible; it is much easier if there has been a general knowledge and enlarged information given as the child grows up. That does not mean that I am in any sense against biological education in the schools. On the contrary, I think it is fundamental that children should have a right knowledge of this great science of life, but there is no reason why the parents should not take their share in that instruction; it will come more easily to the children who have the natural biological outlook, so to speak, produced in their minds. Speaking from personal experience, I cannot see that there is any objection to the boys and girls having in addition some increased information given to them from without, by people who will treat this subject from the scientific angle, because the story of reproduction is such a wonderful and beautiful

story, and it is easy for people who know its marvels from the scientific angle to put that point of view before the young people. It *can* be done, as has been shown by experience over and over again. Some people think that it is very alarming to children to be told these things, and to people of that persuasion I wish I could pass on the impression made upon me by a woman I heard speaking on one occasion at Birmingham. A meeting had been arranged by the teachers there to discuss the question of sex hygiene. After the two main speeches by a man and a woman the subject was thrown open to discussion by the assembled teachers, and was discussed by them in an extraordinarily useful and helpful way, and there was one woman there who brought home more than anyone I have ever heard, the necessity for the teaching of this sort of fact to children. She was speaking particularly of the children of the elementary schools—children of the working classes, but, after all, there is not a very great difference in the problem whatever children are being considered. Some speaker had said it had been a great shock to a certain group of girls to be told these things, and that it had really upset them very much and they had come to him in great trouble about it. Then the woman of whom I am speaking got up and spoke on that text “shock,” and I have always regretted that she could not be heard by any audience at all doubtful on the subject: she made the most vivid, impressive, and impassioned speech that I have ever heard on that question of “shock.” She said: “Do those people realise what shock can be, who say that those girls were shocked when they were told the facts of reproduction in a perfectly decent way by decent people? I do not think they can. I have known children leaving the elementary schools at 14 and going into factories knowing nothing, and then having the whole thing thrust upon them in the most degrading and debasing and abominable manner, and I know what the effect has been upon those girls. That is *shock*.” And it seems to me you are sending children out liable to the kind of shock produced by unsuitable presentation of this subject if you do not protect them by the positive knowledge which comes from having given them the necessary information in a desirable manner.

These are some of the points in regard to which it does seem that the home and the education given in it are going to matter a great deal.

One last word about a special problem. As you know, what is now known as the British Social Hygiene Council started as the National Council for Combating Venereal Diseases, and undoubtedly the family has a certain responsibility in this matter, because it is in the family above all that the moral atmosphere and standards are given to the individual. Many of us think that although it is still our duty to push forward every kind of medical treatment that is available for the relief of the sufferers from venereal disease, that is only a palliative measure, and that the really important problem is to prevent the arising of these diseases and that can only be done if people are prevented from putting themselves into positions where they are liable to get that infection. It is necessary to have the right point of view—it is the state of mind that is going to matter in regard to these diseases. When it is realised that these diseases are contagious diseases, that very fact means that there is a certain and precise way of limiting them. Unless a person comes in actual contact with an individual suffering from the diseases the disease cannot be acquired and that means that these things could be stamped out in a generation if only a right public opinion in the matter could be developed. It is extraordinarily important that there should be the right attitude of mind towards sex matters—the one involved in what is often spoken of as the 'single moral standard'—and that will not be until the women of the country are convinced. Many women would give lip service to this ideal and say they are convinced there should be only a single moral standard, but amongst these there probably are a large number who would not be so upset, so shocked, so distressed, if they found that their son had had some irregular kind of sex experience as if their daughter had had it: and until they feel it is as vital for the boy to keep himself morally clean and chaste as it is for the girl, I do not think this great problem can be solved. In connection with this, may I refer back to a subject touched upon earlier. I mentioned the subject of inhibition, about which I have sometimes differed from some physiologists and more psychologists who say that inhibition in itself is bad, because it is the negative aspect which we do not want to inculcate. Here it seems to me that they are not making a distinction between *repression* and *inhibition*. In the case of sex repression it would mean that the individual would not be

allowed to take the thing out and look at it, so to speak, but would be told he must not ask questions about it or think about it, so that in time it would be pushed back below the consciousness as something which is not to be considered. That sort of thing, I think all are agreed, may cause serious disturbances, from the psychological point of view; but inhibition is something very different. It necessitates the possession of knowledge about the whole matter, and consideration of that knowledge from all its aspects—from the physiological, from the moral, from the mental, and then the definite decision to refrain from certain lines of conduct based on the conclusion that a certain amount of inhibition with reference to sex matters is essential, and will bring not harm but good to the community, the race, and the individual.

• .

THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL HYGIENE.

By SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME K C B, M D, Vice-President,
British Social Hygiene Council

IN discussing so inclusive a subject, the first need is clearly to distinguish the meaning which is attached to its terms. Mankind all over the world is aggregated in smaller or larger groups, and the word community is used here in the sense of the total number of persons who influence or can be influenced by the activity or passivity of any individual. It may thus be world-wide, but has special reference to the individual's own country, to the town or village in which he lives and works, and to the family of which he forms a fraction. Whether we think of the individual as constituting in his entire being the temple of God, or regard him as merely a brick, to be used or rejected according as he serves to build the temple of humanity, it will be found that the two conceptions converge, and that both are needed if humanity is to receive and to give its best.

In securing this best, we are concerned largely with problems of social hygiene, in the study of which we aim at the reduction of vice and crime, of poverty, and of disease, human progress in civilization depending on success in the all-embracing measures for combating these great evils. On the success already attained in the reduction of disease and in the prolongation of human life by measures of public health and by social amelioration, and on the sanitary and allied social reforms by which these have been achieved, I need not dwell in the present article; but it is necessary at the outset to indicate that success has been least against the catarrhal infections (excluding tuberculosis) to which man is subject and against the diseases in the production or the continuance of which personal conduct is involved. One such disease and vice, Alcoholism although steadily declining, is still a terrible cause of havoc to the community, and another even greater social evil, that of venereal disease, although possibly also declining, is still credited on good authority, as being, directly

or indirectly, one of the four greatest causes of death. It stands alongside of cancer, tuberculosis, and pneumonia, and may even be the most serious of these four great enemies of mankind.

Definition of Social Hygiene

Although there may not be complete justification for it, the term "social hygiene" in this country and still more across the Atlantic is being used with special reference to the problem of the control of venereal diseases and of the sexual irregularities which produce them, and it is in this limited sense that the phrase is used in this paper. Thus the National Council for Combating Venereal Diseases has recently changed its title to that of the British Social Hygiene Council, as indicating its aim to educate public opinion and secure wider action which will not merely be concerned with the treatment and prevention of venereal diseases, but also with the social problems involved in their prevention.

A word on the history of this past work. The activities of the National Council for Combating Venereal Diseases consisted of propaganda as to the dangers of venereal disease, of teaching in sex hygiene, and of activities directed to promote the wider establishment and utilisation of the clinics for the treatment, and laboratories for the diagnosis of, venereal disease, initiated in 1916 on the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Venereal Disease by the Government in association with the large local Authorities of the Country. Legislation, furthermore, was enacted prohibiting the advertisement of quack remedies and the treatment of these diseases by unqualified persons, and the work of local authorities has doubtless diminished the sources of infection, secured the cure of large numbers already infected, while this work and that of the National Council has succeeded in dissuading many more from exposing themselves to the risk of infection.

Although usually in the case of women and always for children, infection has been innocently received, it is nevertheless true that the *sole source* of infection by venereal disease is extra-marital sexual relations; for each innocent infection has meant a prior indulgence in sexual irregularity, and could sexual irregularity be eliminated, venereal diseases, one of the four greatest causes of human mortality would disappear in one or at the latest in two generations. This being so, measures on the above lines cannot

be expected to do more than diminish the evil, and there is evident need in addition for such teaching and practice of social hygiene as will conduce to a more general maintenance of the integrity of family life, in which venereal disease is unknown unless introduced from without, as the result of incontinence prior to or during married life.

I do not propose to discuss in this paper the question of personal prophylaxis, at the time of or immediately after sexual irregularity as a possible alternative method to chastity and marital fidelity for the elimination of venereal disease. From such data as are available I infer that (1) prophylaxis is an inadequate and precarious protection, except in the conditions of naval or military life with rigidly enforced discipline; and consider (2) that, although I would not prevent any person who, notwithstanding hygienic and moral warning was determined on an irregular sexual relationship, from obtaining the needed preparations for prophylaxis, I should (3) regard the distribution of general information on the subject, as implying a sort of partnership in the projected immorality, as possibly encouraging widened promiscuity, and as seriously detracting from the effect of the teaching of continence, which is the greatest need of the present time

If the prevention of venereal disease cannot with any prospect of complete success be compassed on purely physical lines, by attacking the microbes causing them at the time and place of their reception; and if the attempt to do this on an adequate scale implies—as in my view, it does—a great hygienic as well as an extremely serious moral loss, on what lines of action can one hope for the permanent success, which will enhance the success of the official agencies already at work, and will ultimately render these less and less necessary?

Aim of Social Hygiene.

This question can be answered when we appreciate that the prevention of venereal disease, although an immediate, is not the chief aim of social hygiene as defined in this paper. Inasmuch as any relation between the sexes which implies the risk of venereal disease is either directly the result, or in an earlier relationship has been the result, of an infringement of chastity or marital fidelity, it is this breach of morality, this tampering with the

ideals of love, that is the chief evil, needing to be attacked in the larger interests of public morality.

A Problem of Conduct

The community problem of Social Hygiene then is a Problem of Conduct, and conduct being dependent on character, Social Hygiene is concerned with the possibilities of influencing character by means of the sum of environmental influences, whether public opinion, or education, or religion, or any other influence, and of thus elevating personal ideals of conduct and making sexual morality more general than it is at present.

How can this be done? Even assuming, as we do, the axiom that monogamy forms the path of safety for family life and constitutes the highest ideal of conduct, can we expect life-long continence on the part of all those men and women for whom in present social circumstances marriage may be unattainable?

Much light is thrown on the possibilities of influencing character and conduct in relation to health by the history of man biologically and anthropologically, as well as by the insight into the motives and formation of character afforded by the teaching of modern psychology; and we cannot afford to neglect this study of man in relation to the rest of the animal creation, to the circumstances of primeval man, and to the historical changes in the relation of men and women, as bearing on the sexual morality of to-day.

Recollection of the facts of evolution should make our judgments of moral conduct more merciful, for not only in Darwin's words "man still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of his lowly origin", but in mental outlook and moral conduct the same stamp is visible. The pre-natal changes in the human foetus, which are anatomically verifiable, may, indeed, be regarded as symbolical of the different stages of passage from the brute to the 20th century man or woman of the highest moral type.

The Evolution of Character

The evolution of man's moral powers in history, reminds us, like his physical evolution, of his humble origin, and one cannot wonder therefore that morality, looked at psychologically, has been described as having its roots in the soil, if not in the dung hill. It is the co-existence of these higher and lower partners in human life that constitutes the tragedy and the glory of man.

The tragedy is rooted in his ancestry, which makes him always in some measure a creature divided against himself. Animals find themselves entirely equal in their lives to the demands upon them, while man's part in the process of time has become more exacting and seldom free from inward conflict, owing to the higher part which social life calls upon him to play, and to the fact that the cultural conditions in organized life have introduced conflict between these higher needs and the effort to survive of the organic mechanisms adjusted to our former primitive needs. Of the illustrations of such changes in the development of human society may be mentioned the substitution of organised justice for personal or familial vengeance, and the primitive institution of marriage and its later developments.* Community life has necessitated the exercise of sympathy, and it is on sympathy that moral progress is based, and this foundation stone has been laid largely in connection with the love of wife and child. Community life, furthermore, has necessitated the regulation of the conduct of those who were unwilling to conform to the current social standard; and thus customs were established and punishment inflicted for their infringement. These customs were modified as need expanded and views changed. In view of the gradual and partial growth of social standards it is not difficult to understand how moralities can clash, the mutual dependence and aid in one community, for instance, co-existing with savagery or warfare when two communities are in conflict.

The social instinct of human nature is bi-partite, and both historically and in the present age it may be limited to the passive forbearance or action which is consistent with the welfare of others in the same group; or it may evolve into active beneficence. Largely in virtue of the first of these elements, moral conduct has become gradually less patchy in character, and the dead-weight of individualistic self-regard has been diminished. The history of social welfare is the story of increasing progress towards the fulfilment of this ideal; and this progress has never been so rapid or so great as in the last 100 years, in which active desire for the welfare of those not in our immediate group has supplemented to an unprecedented extent the influences working for family and

* See the admirable study of this and allied subjects in "The Approach to Social Medicine," by Francis Lee Dunham, M.D. (Williams & Wilkins Co.) 1925.

parochial well-being. Love of our neighbours is becoming the wider love of mankind. To assert this is not to deny that we have in our midst people and groups of people who form residual pools of barbarism. But these pools are fewer and smaller than erstwhile. In the foundations of social science as stated by Socrates, and developed on the lines of Plato and Aristotle, the individual was regarded as living only in and through the community, and in Plato's Republic the principle of justice is upheld as a means of harmonious co-operation between the individual unit and society. These ideals were then the possession of the few, and the treacherous internecine wars of the Greeks and the slavery and moral degradation among both Greeks and Romans in their later developments show the lack of success of these ideals. But as Marvin* has put it, through these and other historic periods there was developing a growing sense of human fellowship, a respect for others, and a care for immaterial things.

Many illustrations of growth in moral sentiment might be adduced. Until the 19th century slavery was a normal part of life for a large part of humanity; and when agitating against negro slavery the British public still were strangely indifferent to the savagery of their penal code and to the cruelty to children associated with the rapid growth of factory work.

In recent decades there has been a marvellous growth of practical altruism. We need merely allude in illustration of this to the various enactments for the industrial protection of children and women, to the Children Acts, to the enforcement of regulations for the safety of ships, all our public health acts and regulations, and the compulsory education of the young; which may be matched on the voluntary side by various missionary efforts at home and abroad, by the stream of charitable subscriptions for our hospitals and other institutions, and by the large sums obtainable when any great national or foreign calamity occurs. This marvellous display of public and private beneficence on a gigantic scale is a recent phenomenon, and the evidence is clear that not only is the mutual tolerance which is indispensable for communal life more generally distributed but that active helpfulness has greatly increased. This is shown not only in the self-denying conduct of socially-minded persons, but also by legislative

* See "The Living Past," by F. S. Marvin.

enactment, backed by the force of public opinion, for the coercion of the anti-social minority of the community.

The present position of the child is the most striking witness to the progress in social morality already secured. Abortion and infanticide have become exceptional, and the child is the subject of greater care and solicitude than ever in the past, and for the first time in history, in recent years the Government of this country and to some extent of other countries, through the organization of official measures in aid of family life and in other ways, has shown its passionate attachment to the infant in the earliest months and years of its life, and its realisation that in the child lies the hope of the future. It is on behalf of the child, moreover, that the most persuasive and influential appeal can be made in the interest of sexual morality.

Marital, parental and filial love have built up the family as the social unit of the community; and the organized community, on its side, as indicated above, has reciprocated by the organization of systematic measures for the protection of the infant and child, and when necessary by the compulsory control of those parents whose social instincts are lacking or aberrant. In further illustration of this co-operation of the community and the family, may be adduced the increasing official arrangements for giving counsel and help to the wife and to the expectant mother which have been organized in the last twelve years. We are realising the fact that it is the beginning of hygienic wisdom to guarantee to the expectant mother adequate nutrition, general conditions of health, and freedom from infections, if the physical and social health of the future is to be improved.

History then leaves us with the satisfactory reflection that in many branches of community life there has been vast improvement in the sense of social responsibility and in practical action resulting from this sense. In matters of justice, of the prevention of cruelty, and of the consequences of destitution, as well as in the treatment and the prevention of disease, this is conspicuously the case.

The Growth of Sexual Morality

How do matters stand as regards sexual morality? Here also there is indubitable evidence of improvement. No one can rise from the perusal of some chapters in Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, or in Lecky's *History of European Morals*, or still less from

dipping into the eight volumes of Pierre Dufour's "*Histoire de la Prostitution chez tous les peuples du Monde depuis l'antiquité etc*" without appreciating the increase not only of decency and propriety, but also the improvement in private and public opinion and conduct. Only a few illustrative facts can be mentioned here.

There is as Westermarck remarks ("*History of Human Marriage*," p 133), "not a shred of genuine evidence for the notion that promiscuity ever formed a general stage in the social history of mankind." Among the Jews polygamy was permitted with rigid regard for women's fidelity. The Greeks were monogamous, thus proclaiming the theoretical superiority of their civilization over that of the Asiatics, but in both the Greek and Roman civilizations outside marriage there was widespread bisexual and monosexual vice. There was keen desire to maintain the sanctity of marriage and keep the domestic circle "unassailed and unpolluted." Every man desired to be certain of the paternity of the children in his family and was prepared for stringent action against "the incursions of irregular passions within the domestic circle" (W E H. Lecky, "*History of European Morals*," p 119, ed 1911). The extent of monosexual vice may be guessed from V 24, Chap 1, of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and history is largely concerned with its unsavoury details. The post-apostolic teaching was an excessive rebound against Greek and Roman corruption, all bodily passions being regarded as necessarily evil: and the essential part which physical as well as spiritual forces play in the uplifting of human life and in the development of social ideals was often gravely misunderstood.

The efforts of ascetics in the early centuries of the Christian era while "imprinting on the minds of men a profound and enduring conviction of the importance of chastity" were noxious in relation to marriage, and did little to raise the mass of mankind from sexual vices. Even in the middle ages this mistaken teaching still prevailed, as evidenced by the custom of refraining from the marriage bed on the night of the wedding day when the sacrament had been received. The priestly belittlement of women was further illustrated (Lecky, p. 142) in the 6th century in one province by forbidding women to receive the sacrament with their naked hands. Prostitution was commonly regarded as a necessary evil, and as late as the 12th century an Anglican Bishop was responsible for licensing a row of brothels near London Bridge.

Lecky (p 119) sums up the situation not unfairly as follows :—

“ The obligation of extra-marital purity has never been approximately regarded ; and in all nations, ages, and religions a vast mass of irregular indulgence has appeared, which has probably contributed more than any other single cause to the misery and degradation of man ”

Right through the centuries there is a marked “ contrast between the levity with which the frailty of man has been regarded and the extreme severity with which women who have been guilty of the same offence have been generally treated ” ; and the problem of social hygiene, from one angle, is to ascertain how an act which even now is regarded as venial in a man and infamous in a woman can by force of public opinion be made equally infamous in the two sexes. There is, it may be remarked parenthetically, no adequate justification for a differing moral judgment based on differences between the sexes in natural passion. These differences are probably smaller than is supposed. The effective differences between the sexes have been those of environment and especially of public opinion, and the same influences can be made as effective for men as for women.

In aiming at a high and equal standard of conduct for the sexes, past history indicates the practicability of progressive improvement. Humanity, notwithstanding some sinister features in the present day, is on the up-grade, and we may well agree with Westermarck's conclusion (p 530) that

“ The history of human marriage is the history of a relation in which women have been gradually triumphing over the passions, the prejudices, and the selfish interests of men ”

The conclusion that sexual morality has improved as compared with ancient, or mediæval times, or even with recent centuries in this country, is not inconsistent with the statement that the two great venereal diseases, syphilis and gonorrhoea, are among the greatest causes of sickness and death in our midst, nor with the even more serious fact that in many social circles the integrity of the family is disturbed and its high ideals injured by widespread sexual irregularity.

Nor is the conclusion that the standard of sexual morality is higher and oftener maintained than in the past, inconsistent with a realisation that in circumstances of great national excitement

especially in war, we are made to realise how easily the moral armour of the average youth and maiden may be pierced under the influence of the erotic excitement associated with these upheavals. Here history repeats itself. The desperation and despair of the Black Death of 1348-50 which destroyed nearly a quarter of the population of this country were associated with a common abandonment of all restraint and a reckless indulgence in wild debaucheries. So also in the plague and famine years of 1491-5 when, in the words of a medical historian, "the corruption of morals reached a height without a parallel in ancient times". The murders of the French Revolution, 1793, and recent Bolshevik crimes, and in vice the sexual laxity during the Great War, show similarly the mastery which the primitive animal can resume over the inherited human culture of the ages.

Two further factors may be mentioned as possibly retarding the moral and physical improvement which may be expected from social propaganda and the provision of skilled medical aid for all who become venereally infected. We read in *Macbeth* of those "that go the primrose way to the everlasting bonfire"; but fear of punishment hereafter probably has never been an effective motive in the avoidance of vice; and in experience decrease in venereal disease and probably also improvement in sexual morality have coincided with the decline of this particular spiritual fear.

A more immediate fear has greatly decreased in connection with sexual relations in which the avoidance of conception or of venereal infection is desired. The use of contraceptives has made married life without children practicable and frequent, and the use of prophylactic disinfectants or devices can reduce the risk of venereal infection, although the protection secured in practice is precarious, especially when most needed—in the circumstances of promiscuity. In what proportion reduction of venereal infection is due to these practices and in what proportion to educational measures and the arrangements for prompt and efficient diagnosis and treatment cannot be stated; but in civilian life measures for preventing infection in irregular sex relations certainly have had a very minor influence on the result.

The Present Problem.

Furthermore, as already indicated, even were there no venereal diseases, irregular sex relations are the chief enemy of normal

family life, on which Christian civilisation is based. And our problem, therefore, is how can such irregular sex relations be minimised?

That this is the problem is emphasised by the evidence of current life, which points to the conclusion that prostitution as a separate occupation is declining, but that there has occurred some increase of temporary unions outside matrimony which are not casual. In so far as these unions result from mutual affection they may be regarded as on a somewhat higher moral level than the paid relationship of prostitution. No children need result from these unions, and if pregnancy happens the relationship can sometimes be made permanent by matrimony, and injury to the offspring thus partially avoided.

Such is the line of argument now sometimes employed, and teachers of morality are expected to be ready either to endorse it or to repudiate it with reasoned argument. What can be urged from the individual and from the communal standpoint?

Promiscuity and the Social Order.

If the teaching of history is to have weight, it must be accepted that promiscuity in the sense of casual sexual congress is the chief enemy of the social order, as well as the main source of the great scourges of humanity, syphilis and gonorrhœa.

This is so, among other reasons, because the relationship is merely material, the purchase and sale of a human body, which degrades men and women below the level of animals, especially of those animals in whom there is definite and continued family life. The arguments against promiscuity apply to a modified extent to irregular unions which are non-mercenary, but in the breaking of which cruelty to one partner is commonly involved, and a trend towards promiscuity initiated. The personal and social reasons for pre-marital chastity and post-marital continence and faithfulness have been stated in an admirable article by Miss Alison Neilans, of the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene, which is utilised in the following summary.

Among the personal reasons the first is that *illicit relations are a sin against love*. Sex needs to be placed before adolescents and adults, not as animal and even disgusting, but as the physical basis of ideal love, the theme of the chief romance of life, and the power which links us with God as conscious creators.

Then *illicit relations are a sin against our own self-respect.* The furtive shifts and the secrecy of such relations introduce an element of dishonesty into life. There is anxiety and disharmony in the entire relationship which react unfavourably on mind and on character.

Illicit relations are contrary to our intuitive sense of right Apart from State or religious authority or convention, most persons intuitively realise that sex is a serious matter and that regret and remorse follow when we fall below our subconscious ideals

The effect of incontinence on the partner in the relation is degrading. Individual remorse is or should be the fate of one who is responsible for the demoralisation of another. A supremely great need is the increasing cultivation of public opinion and conscience, which will destroy the differing view of male and female incontinence. A woman's honour is regarded as her greatest possession, but there is still widespread failure to realise that he is a dastard who deprives her of this possession or who encourages her continuance in an irregular life.

The effect on present or future wife, apart from the possible conveyance of disease, is deplorable. It is the last insult to a wife in the words of St. Paul to "make her members the member of a harlot", and the conditions of durability and success of happy married life are endangered when one of the partners fails to bring to it the attribute of chastity.

On the community a serious injury is inflicted by irregular unions, even when mutual love is involved; for one such union is commonly replaced by another, and this is a frequent beginning of promiscuity, and for the woman of prostitution.

Every adult, furthermore, has a serious responsibility to aid the prevalence of a high standard of sexual conduct, not only for the security of the present generation, but also on behalf of racial quality. This motive of race continuity has not been adequately stressed. Mankind may learn something in this respect even from the fishes which undertake a perilous migration to their spawning place, leaving weirs and traversing shallow brooks, that their progeny may start life in the most favourable circumstances.

The Double Moral Standard

A chief obstacle to reform, and a chief reason why improvement through the ages has been so slow, is, as has been already

indicated, the double social standard, which regards sexual irregularity as a venial offence in one sex and a serious one in the other sex. With the spread of knowledge of contraceptives and the increasing replacement of the professional prostitute by the unpaid woman, it is clear that without male chastity female in chastity must become more frequent; that if men do not raise their standard of conduct, it will necessarily be lowered for an increasing number of women. There is an evident need of spiritual motives for sexual self-control. For, as stated by Miss Neilans—

“the penalty of giving rein to irresponsible sexual impulse is not necessarily venereal disease; the penalty is that the man or woman who does so is thwarting and starving his best self, and in consequence is torn with conflicting desires: the social and spiritual nature pulling in one direction and the animal and self-seeking nature in the other.”

Robert Burns well expressed this when he wrote of roving sensual passion :—

“But och ' it hardens a' within
And petrifies the feeling.”

A number of questions have been propounded in the preceding pages, and have either remained unanswered or have received only suggestions of answers. Even so, it is well to be faced with the essential considerations. Thus, we have asked in what direction can we act to supplement and steadily to render less necessary present official hygienic and medical measures for the control of venereal diseases? The answer is through the general adoption of sexual morality in the communal interest. But is the necessarily high standard of conduct which is needed practicable for the majority of people? A partial answer is suggested in the slow forces which have instituted family life and the altruism which is implied in it; and the widening distribution of the desire to secure the welfare of strangers as well as of neighbours and of one's own family and especially the passion for the welfare of the child give further hope, which notwithstanding some sinister features is confirmed by the historical evidence of increasing regard for sexual morality as the centuries proceed.

But the progress towards the moral ideal has been terribly slow, and the diseases resulting from contravention of this ideal have never been even partially controlled prior to the active medical measures which were organised in this country on a national scale in the year 1916. Our final questions then are how can this partial medical control be made more effective and how can the partial control, which is all that medicine can supply, be rendered less and less necessary by measures which will diminish sexual irregularities and so make medical and non-moral hygiene superfluous ?

We need not despise medical measures. They are our first line of attack in present circumstances, and are doing incalculable good. Nor can we to-day desire to encourage a high standard of sexual conduct by inflicting disease as a punishment for departure from this standard. For this reason, official medical measures in the interest of the community are making even promiscuity less prone to insemminate disease, while carefully guarding against responsibility for or partnership in this promiscuity. But as already stated possibilities are limited in this direction ; and our efforts must be directed into further channels if the maximum good is to be achieved.

Much further action is practicable by extensions of our present medical services and by social work in connection with these. There has been considerable neglect of present opportunities for the treatment of congenital syphilis and of the parents of such patients. To discuss other feasible lines of advance on medical lines is impracticable in this paper.

Law Enforcement.

In enforcement of law there is scope for increased activity, and our social duty necessitates continuous vigilance in securing the election on Watch or Police Committees of those who will see that present laws against vice are impartially and fully enforced. If members of the public continue to decline to give evidence in such cases, they become partially responsible for the continuance of vice. A Departmental Committee has been asked for on the laws of solicitation, and it may be hoped that it will be appointed and will report against the folly of fining prostitutes for this offence, and thus making it necessary for them to ply their trade with increased assiduity. At present the law enables the occupier

of the house in which prostitution occurs to be prosecuted, but the principals to the act go unpunished. The barter of sex is an anti-social act always and everywhere. Should it not be the duty of the State to declare such an act illegal? To place such an inhibition on the statute book would greatly facilitate the reduction of the coarser forms of commercialised vice. A more rigid definition of brothel is needed, and the prohibition of the use of hotels and lodging houses for prostitution is called for. It may be urged parrot-wise that this is driving the evil underground, but experience has demonstrated that vice is diminished by rendering it more difficult. It is supremely important to convince the average mind that real good is done by reducing the temptations to vice. A great social need is an increase in the number of social workers attached to police courts, who will get into sympathetic touch with sexual offenders, and secure their treatment medically and socially. Divorce has important bearings on the prevention of venereal diseases. Where the integrity of family life has been broken, for instance, by the penal servitude of the husband, by prolonged and apparently incurable insanity, or by desertion continued over a series of years divorce should be practicable. Such proposals offend the views of many; but divorce given for these reasons is preferable to the sexual irregularities which commonly are the alternative, and it may be hoped that Churchmen while retaining their own convictions will become willing to give liberty to persons desiring divorce when the need for this is indicated in the communal interest.

The protection of feeble-minded persons by segregation is urgently needed, but this can only be given when the community is willing to provide the institutional provision for such persons, which at present is lamentably deficient.

Economics of Marriage

The encouragement of early marriages opens up a wide field for discussion as to the possibility of a less luxurious standard of life, as to taxation in relation to marriage and the size of the family, and as to the encouragement of the study of cookery and domestic management as important accomplishments for the success of married life.

• It is not possible to discuss here the economic difficulties which lead to postponement of marriage or to its being out of the

question. The difficulty of securing house accommodation is a further intricate problem which I think will only be solved when, in addition to change in the industrial factors of profiteering and inefficiency of work, we are determined to spend a larger proportion of our total income on rents, diverting expenditure from alcoholic drinks and other superfluous expenses.

But when every aid to conduct which is socially ethical has been provided, the essential problem is how can we cultivate the character of each child and adolescent so as to render sexual offences against the community exceptional? The best of heathendom and Christianity always have voiced the universal experience of the grave danger to the spiritual self of uncontrolled sex-impulse, and the need for assistance from religious as well as other motives in the strengthening and developing of what is best in man. In attaining this end, every approach needs to be utilised, biological, psychological, ethical and religious.

Biology reminds us of our origin, and should make us merciful in our judgment of the many who lag behind in moral progress.

Physiology gives a further reason for mercy in judgment, in our increasing knowledge of the chemical correlations of the endocrine glands, the individual precocity, retardation and acuity of passion varying in accordance with their activity, though in most people within a relatively small range. We know too much to justify our regarding ourselves as ever being the merely helpless victims of these glands; but these physiological differences confirm the need for charitable judgment.

Power of Public Opinion.

A study of society shows that social groupings necessarily impose rigid limitations on animal impulses, and these are especially enforced by the community in respect of the physiological acts leading to reproduction. By such restrictions conduct is made to conform with the prevailing standard of the community; and apart from any higher sanction, it is the praise or blame of associates which gives the standard of "right" for the individual code. Hence it follows that our chief line of social safety in sex matters consists in the cultivation by every legitimate method of right public opinion. In moral matters public opinion is more important than the legislative or executive restrictions which

may make this opinion obligatory. But the objection to compulsion in moral restraint *per se* is inconsistent with the teaching of history and with the experience of our own times : though, when it comes to questions like restrictions on indecent pictures, on pornographic novels, on plays in which—alas ! too often—the ideal is not that of married love, and on unhealthy cinematographs, one must remember that people get what they desire ; and unless those who desire clean wholesome literature and plays become persistently vocal and show that indecency in motive or in plot does not pay, these obstacles to clean life will continue to be rampant. We may well remember that although the gutter and the sewer play a part in real life, we are not bound to wallow in them. Would that some of our popular novelists would remember this !

Ethical Control

But the moral and spiritual attitude constitutes the hope for the future ; and this is only possible if it is cultivated. The study of psychology and its application in the training of the young gives the means to the development of the necessary control over instinctive tendencies. Apart, furthermore, from the unknown allowance required by the varying extent to which endocrine functions modify the individual problem, the directive forces arising from the herd and community life give the “ conditional stimuli for the development of social control or organization of our primitive or animal impulses ” (Dunham). These forces include the whole of the educational influences of life. Now that we know that not only can intelligence be measured in part, but also—what is more important—that our impulses (appetites and attitudes (feelings) can be analysed, there are opened out ways of recognising and utilising the play of these fundamental forces in the formation of character. The study of human emotions and the cultivation of their control is indispensable for ideal human life, and, it may be added, is equally necessary for making democracy safe for the world.

Man's ethical, his mental, or his physical nature may be defective, with corresponding defects of character, of intelligence or of health. It is necessary always to remember that the three can seldom be entirely separated. In a legitimate sense ‘ mental ’ means not only “ intellectual ” but also “ moral ”, and the

best psychology is embodied in the words "keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life"

Conduct must be judged in relation to the benefit of the entire community, and it is for this reason that natural sexual impulses have been subjected to some measure of regulation from the earliest ages, and that we condemn increasingly the satisfaction of passion without the range of society's institutions. Conduct being the resultant of character, and character the product of feelings, desires, control, interest, attitude, mood, sentiment, etc., sin may be defined in Dunham's words as "the deliberate failure to interpret an impulse with a view to confirm or to increase the instinctive integration of character."

The psychological training of character in the home, the school, and in social and industrial circumstances cannot be discussed here. In the previous paper (*The Moral Aspects of Social Hygiene*, *Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1924, and *Journal of Social Hygiene*, N Y., Dec., 1924), I have briefly indicated some aspects of it, and there are available psychological and educational books on the character training of young children and of adolescents.

I may, however, be permitted to suggest several practical lines on which valuable aid in the cultivation of conduct is practicable.

Our elementary and secondary schools already take a momentous part in the development of individual character. In relation to sexual hygiene what can be more important than the adoption of the following measures, or their extension if already partially in operation?

- (1) That education authorities should give facilities to teachers to attend special courses of lectures on social hygiene and ethics, including the payment of their travelling expenses when necessary.
- (2) That education authorities should lend school buildings for conferences between teachers and parents on the same subject.
- (3) That the Board of Education should issue a special syllabus, possibly also a handbook, on social hygiene and character training, on similar lines to the existing syllabus on the teaching of hygiene and temperance.
- (4) That in all secondary schools steps should be taken to secure the teaching of biology, including physiology.

and hygiene, in which might very properly be introduced teaching as to the responsibilities of family life and parenthood.

Much can be done by direct teaching of the young in schools
But it is necessary—

- (5) That Government and other large employers should be roused to a sense of their moral responsibility for the adolescent youths and girls employed by them. Some Government Departments have declined to give facilities for addresses on social hygiene to their employees, while others have agreed. Evidently public opinion is needed to alter this and to minimise the risks of moral corruption when large numbers of young people are aggregated without wise direction.

An important further point in connection with the local work of the British Social Hygiene Council is to remember—

- (6) That its work of special propaganda is most valuable when it is associated with the steady teaching of adolescent groups as they leave school, and with a continuous effort to place ethical on an equal footing with intellectual training.

“ Hot air ” spasmodic efforts are not likely to lead to permanent improvement, and furthermore it is certain—

- (7) That *ad hoc* educational effort directed solely to sexual hygiene is relatively ineffective. Now that local authorities possess power to spend money on all branches of public health education, it will become practicable for public health and education authorities to combine in the general cultivation of higher standards of life, sexual hygiene then taking its place with other branches of teaching directed towards self-control as affecting health. This joint responsibility of education and public health authorities for adolescents extends to the provision of adequate recreative facilities, and in this connection there is opened out a vast sphere of communal activity which can be made to bear abundant fruit in improved morality as well as in better health.

The possibilities of character training are enormous, not only in the special directions suggested above, but also even more in the daily interference which takes place with the freedom of egoistic motives from infancy onwards, and in the necessary clashing between animal appetites and the conscience, or intuitive self-analysis, which in children brought up satisfactorily "hath a thousand several tongues" of guidance and warning. All this implies struggle and conflict in life. Morality, in fact, means victory over nature. It appears inevitable that in man's slow ascent the price of higher satisfaction is some crucifixion of spontaneous desires, and we can, I think, aver that in making up our ledger of happiness the gain is on the side of higher ideals and conduct. There must be sacrifice in some measure for all. For the anti-social whose egoism blocks the road of progress it becomes more or less obligatory, for others it represents a real gain in fulness of life. In respect of all human endeavours there is the natural road and the ethical. We may abandon hope, as J. A. Spender has put it, "if we cannot believe that the 'natural' is under control." We must, as Lord Grey said in another connection, "learn or perish", learn to maintain and to raise our standard of moral character, or fall like ancient Greece and Rome did, after they had become the moral sewers of the nations. The community cannot prosper in essentials and cannot survive in health without morality. Morality means personal conduct which in every respect is favourable to the welfare of the community. But the survival of the individual is dependent on community organisation. And we thus arrive at what may be regarded as the harsh conclusion that sexual morality being required for the welfare of the community, those for whom marriage is impracticable on the highest grounds are required to sublimate their passion by processes of re-education, diverting the energy arising from instinctive conflicts towards art, service, religion and other cultural interests. The value of play and recreation, of various forms of social entertainment and converse to this end is well known. Such sublimation is needed by all of us in varying degree, and the science and art of community life will in the future be increasingly concerned in various endeavours to supply adequate æsthetic, recreational and social outlets for the young, especially between the ages of 15 and 30.

It will have been seen—(1) that I consider that the control of venereal diseases should become more and more a question of organising public opinion and action against irregular sex relations, which for practical purposes are solely responsible for these diseases, though I would press for extensions of the medical measures against these diseases which have already had a large measure of success

(2) That I do not consider any short cut to freedom from these diseases likely to have marked success, and I regard the general and public advocacy of prophylaxis in irregular sex relations as inimical to the moral progress by means of which, in conjunction with present and extended medical measures, we shall eventually render these diseases a shadow of their present self

(3) That, although there is evidence of increasing sexual laxity in some circles, history shows a marvellous improvement in this respect as compared with the past I do not believe that the experience of men and women “about town,” or the prurient studies of some popular novels, are consistent with the experience of the mass of our people, for whom happily sexual experience begins with marriage, or never begins at all

(4) That in recent years and especially in the last decade, notwithstanding the terrible sexual lapses during the Great War, the hope of controlling venereal diseases has become increasingly bright

(5) That much good can be made to result from the greater frankness with which sexual problems are now discussed; for although this may be regarded as implying an “eclipse of modesty,” it can also bring about a realisation that, as Professor Arthur Thomson has put it, “Sex at its best is like religion at its best, a reaction of the whole organism, heart, hand and head.”

(6) That the teaching of sex hygiene is important, always, if possible, as part of general physiology and hygiene, although its importance is subsidiary to the teaching indicated in paragraph (8)

(7) That there is profound need for the pressure of public opinion in favour of clean talking and clean writing The mother’s endeavour to teach her boy the sacredness of his own body and “reverence for the channel of motherhood,” is made ineffective while we do not discourage the common sniggering when this subject is mentioned, or its treatment in newspapers in a manner which, as Havelock Ellis puts it, implies that “the sacred temple is treated as a common sewer”

(8) That character training is the most important, but the most neglected, part of our educational system, from the cradle to the university. The object of education, from our present point of view, is to conform the child's reason to that of the community. To this end it is necessary to liberate and organise all the instinctive and emotional powers of each person under the guidance of a rational and ideal purpose. This purpose should include the golden rules of the Gospel, and become an extended altruism which even already is being partially appreciated. This realises and tries to embody in action that we are links in the chain of time, an essential part of one function in life being to "pass on the torch of life undimmed and steadier."

(9) That for some members of the community the accidents and mishaps of matrimonial life, and for others a necessarily celibate life, will call for a higher sacrifice. We are all members one of another, and communal welfare cannot be secured without repetitions of the Crucifixion in every generation.

STATEMENT ON CONTINENCE IN RELATION TO SOCIAL HYGIENE.

*Prepared by the Social Hygiene Committee and Adopted by the
British Social Hygiene Council at their meeting on
March 22nd, 1926.*

GENERAL STATEMENT.

The British Social Hygiene Council are of opinion that —

- (1) In the interests of the race and of the individual it is essential that the stability of the family in marriage should be preserved, and social habits and customs should be adjusted to this end.
- (2) There is overwhelming evidence that irregular sex relations, whether in married or unmarried, lead to physical, mental, and social harm.
- (3) There is no evidence either from physiology or from experience that for the unmarried sexual intercourse is a necessity for the maintenance of physical health
- (4) There is no evidence either from psychology or from experience that for the unmarried sexual intercourse is a necessity for the maintenance of mental health.

SIR THOMAS BARLOW, F R S, M D,
Past Vice-President, B S H C

LADY BARRETT, C B E, M D, M S,
Consulting Obstetric and Gynæcological Surgeon,
Royal Free Hospital

C. J. BOND, C M G, F R C S,
Vice-Chairman, Medical Consultative Council,
Ministry of Health

WILLIAM BROWN, M.A , M.D.,

Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy, University
of Oxford

CYRIL BURT, M A , D.Sc ,

Psychologist to the London County Council

SIR FRANCIS CHAMPNEYS, Bart , M D . F R C P ,

Vice-President, B S H C , and Chairman, Central
Midwives Board

WINIFRED C CULLIS, O B E , D Sc ,

Professor of Physiology, University of London.

ISRAEL FELDMAN, M R C S

Late Senior Lecturer in Physiology, London
Hospital

THE VERY REV DEAN FORD,

Dean of York, and late Headmaster, Harrow

LIEUT -COLONEL F E FREMANTLE, O.B E , F R C S ,
F.R C P , M P ,

Chairman, Parliamentary Medical Committee.

DAME KATHARINE FURSE, D.B E ,

Assistant Chief Commissioner, Girl Guides

R CARY GILSON, M A ,

Headmaster, King Edward VI School,
Birmingham

THE LORD GORELL, C.B E , M.C.,

Past President, B S H.C

SIR WALTER GREAVES-LORD, K C , M.P ,

Recorder of Manchester.

J A HADFIELD, M A , M B ,

Lecturer on Psychology, King's College

SOMERVILLE HASTINGS, F.R C.S.,

Surgeon 1/c Ear and Throat Department, Middle-
sex Hospital.

PROFESSOR MATTHEW HAY, M.D.,
Professor of Forensic Medicine, Aberdeen
University.

PROFESSOR A BOSTOCK HILL, M.Sc., M.D., D.P.H.,
Emeritus Professor, Hygiene and Public Health,
Birmingham University

THE VERY REV W R INGE, D.D.,
Dean of St Paul's

MAURICE W. KEATINGE, D.Sc., M.A.,
Reader in Education in the University of
Oxford

CHARLES W KIMMINS, D.Sc., M.A.,
Ex-Chief Inspector of the Education Depart-
ment of the London County Council.

DR R. DOUGLAS LAURIE, M.A.,
Professor of Zoology, University College of
Wales

C. J. MACALISTER, M.D., F.R.C.P., D.L.,
Ex-President, Liverpool Medical Institute.

REV. F B MEYER, B.A., D.D.,
Ex-President of the National Federation of Free
Churches

H. CRICHTON MILLER, M.A., M.D.,
Hon Director, Tavistock Clinic for Functional
Nerve Cases

SIR WILLIAM MILLIGAN, M.D.,
Member of Executive Committee, B.S.H.C.

J. H. MUIRHEAD, LL.D.,
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, University of
Birmingham

SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME, K.C.B., M.D.,
Late Principal Medical Officer, Local Govern-
ment Board, and Vice-President, B.S.H.C.

NATHAN RAW, C M G , M D , F R ' C S ,
Lord Chancellor's Visitor in Lunacy

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON, C M G , O B E , M D ,
Professor, Public Health, University of
Birmingham

DAME MARY SCHARLIEB, D. B E , M D., M S ,
Consulting Physician for Diseases of Women,
Royal Free Hospital, and Vice-President,
B S H C.

PROFESSOR J ARTHUR THOMSON, M. A , L L D ,
Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen
University.

E B TURNER, F. R C S ,
Late Chairman, Representative Body, B M A ,
and Vice-President, B S H C.

MEMORANDUM.

1 For some time it has been realised that the advances in physiology and psychology, as bearing on sex life in mankind, render it desirable to restate the teaching of science in regard to the reaction of sexual continence on personal well-being.

2 In presenting the statement and the evidence prepared by expert members of the Social Hygiene Committee it has been thought desirable to make the following remarks on the subject from the standpoint of organised social life.

3. The problems of sex are inseparably bound up with those of social life. From earliest times sex relations have been guided and controlled by custom, and in all communities as civilisation has advanced, some of these customs have been embodied in legally imposed limitations. By the majority in each community these restrictions have been accepted as necessary, and have in the course of time been extended to the prohibition and punishment of such crimes as incest, homosexuality, bigamy, any sexual relations below certain ages, procuration, and so on. " "

4. The realisable ideal of monogamous family life has been generally accepted in this country, and is maintained not only by custom, but also increasingly by legal enactment

We regard stable family life as essential to the welfare of the race, and consider that all extra-marital relations in their very nature are a direct attack on marriage and the family, and should be regarded as such by the community. This does not preclude the consideration of reforms of the marriage laws in this country, as, for instance, those recommended by the Royal Commission on Divorce. That this ideal of celibacy and monogamy is practicable is evidenced by the fact that in this country it is the actual life of a large part of the community. Nor is it unreasonable to require the practice of this ideal, in view of the momentous consequences to the social fabric of departure from it. That the limitations of sex relationships involved in this ideal can now also be commended on the basis of biological teaching is indicated in the memoranda.

5. A grave consequence of irregular sex relationships has been the devastating prevalence of venereal diseases. These would completely disappear in a couple of generations, given universal compliance with the ideal standard of conduct. At present these diseases are among the chief causes of death, are responsible for a high proportion of the total occupants of lunatic asylums, and for vast suffering in the innocent as well as in those who incur the direct consequences of their own conduct.

6. We anticipate the time when the moral pressure of public opinion, reinforced by the conscience of the individual, will insist on the presumption that when there is marital infidelity, or when marriage takes place in the absence of previous chastity, the moral culpability is as great in a man as in a woman. The integrity of family life requires this equally high standard; and it will, we are confident, be increasingly demanded

7. We recognise that the present disparity in number of men and women raises in this generation exceptional difficulties, but these difficulties do not justify any social recognition of modification of the basic standard.

8. The widespread knowledge of contraceptives has partially removed from both sexes an important restraining influence on

the side of continence, and it is this fact, as well as our advance in biological knowledge, which has appeared to render the publication of this considered statement desirable. We do not regard the fear of pregnancy or disease as an adequate motive for continence, and we do not regret that extra-marital chastity must in future depend more and more upon basic ideals of life, rather than upon fear of consequences.

9. We are fully aware that the standard of conduct embodied in the preceding paragraphs necessitates abstention from sexual intercourse during part of each individual's adult life ; and this gives added importance to the fact that this basis of conduct in its application to personal life receives support from modern physiology and psychology.

10. Experience over long ages has shown that extra-marital sexual indulgence promotes irresponsibility and is not infrequently followed by sexual excesses and perversions. In such cases there ensues individual demoralisation, with decadence of the community when these practices are widespread.

11. In promoting the advance of social morality and hygiene importance must always attach to the following among other considerations —

12. It is necessary that all young persons should be taught the elements of biology, including physiology and hygiene, thus cultivating that individual self-respect which comes from such knowledge.

13. We regard it as fundamentally important that both parents and teachers should also know the elements of biology, including psychology, as bearing on character ; and that thus character training should become as important a part of home life and school work as the training of intelligence. In this connection we would emphasise the value of more adequate facilities for both physical and mental recreation, and for all measures aiding in the control and sublimation of passion in adolescence and early adult life, among which adequate recreation, exercise and work, moderation in food and abstinence from stimulants play an important part.

14. For the majority of young persons, who are guided less by reason than by ideals and practical aims, we urge the cultivation of competitive athletics, as giving the strongest motive for physical fitness and the surest diversion from the sexual instinct.

15. We urge the necessity of studying the problems of housing, of emigration, of incidence of taxation, of restrictions imposed on marriage in certain employments, and of accepted standards of comfort, with a special view to the adoption of measures facilitating earlier marriage and making family life more universally attainable.

16. There is needed, furthermore, an increasing realisation that society stands for the claims of posterity, and that each man and woman may have the moral responsibility for passing on undimmed the lamp of life.

17. We urge the importance of the cultivation of public opinion in favour of an elevated view of the sexual functions and of the idealisation of love, and of appeals to self-respect and to the sense of right to this end. From the personal standpoint illicit relations, particularly if they are furtive and irresponsible, prevent sex from taking its due place as the physical basis of ideal love. It is to be hoped that in future all illicit relations, whether before or after marriage, will be recognised as contrary to man's higher nature.

18. We recognise, finally, that individual hardship must continue to arise for those who desire marriage, but for whom it may remain impracticable. The welfare of organised society, and in the end of each individual, impels us to advocate this basic standard. The community has reason to appreciate and value highly the sacrifice of those who in such circumstances adhere to this standard.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE
PREPARED BY PHYSIOLOGISTS AND PSYCHOLOGISTS
FOR THE SOCIAL HYGIENE COMMITTEE

SEXUAL CONTINENCE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF PHYSIOLOGY.

Modern physiological development has emphasised in the individual the dual function of the essential reproductive glands, *i.e.*, the testis and the ovary. In each case two distinctive secretions are formed —

- (1) The external secretion, containing the spermatozoon or ovum
- (2) The internal secretion, which, like the internal secretions from other organs and glands of the body, passes either directly or indirectly into the general blood-circulatory system, and has, as yet, little understood effects upon the workings of other organs and tissues. These internal secretions are responsible for the secondary sexual characteristics which normally develop at puberty.

The sex "appetite" has in the past been too loosely classified with the other appetites—hunger, thirst, etc. It is important to emphasise the basic difference. The function of reproduction, while essential for the maintenance of the race, is not essential to the maintenance of the existence or the reactions of the individual organism, whereas the satisfaction of the other appetites is. Apart from this function, the physiological importance of the reproductive glands lies in their co-operation in the communal life of the various parts of the body, this being effected by the internal secretions. The external secretion can be suppressed without interfering with this co-operation. There is no definite physiological evidence to prove that the control of the sexual function in either sex, *i.e.*, partial or complete continence, results in any harmful effect upon the normal physiological activities of the organism.

There is no physiological basis for the oft-repeated (but irresponsible) assertion that sexual intercourse is essential for the maintenance of the healthy metabolisms of the normal organism. Nocturnal emissions are physiologically normal, and there is no scientific evidence to show that these produce any harmful effects upon the general metabolism of the individual experiencing them.

WINIFRED CULLIS, O.B.E., D.Sc.,
Professor of Physiology, University of London

ISRAEL FELDMAN, M.R.C.S.,
Late Senior Lecturer, Physiology, London
Hospital.

JULIAN S. HUXLEY, M.A.,
Professor of Zoology, King's College, London

J. ARTHUR THOMSON, M.A., LL.D.,
Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen
University

SEXUAL CONTINENCE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF PSYCHOLOGY

It is a common fallacy that sexual continence tends to produce disordered mental conditions, a belief which may have arisen in part from the supposed greater frequency of neuroses amongst unmarried people, and in part because psycho-analysts (*i.e.*, the strict followers of Freud) have taught that psycho-neuroses are always due to sexual repression." Although there is an element of truth in both these statements, they are often misinterpreted and misunderstood

It is therefore desirable to restate the matter.

1. *Marriage as the Ideal.*

We regard marriage, which gives an opportunity for the full expression of the sexual instincts in love for the partner, and of the parental instincts in devotion and care for the children, as psychologically the healthiest life for the average individual, man or woman.

2. *Sexual Restraint.*

There is, however, no evidence to lead us to believe that ordinary restraint of natural sexual impulses produces any psychological abnormality. Indeed there are many men and women whose daily experience proves that it is perfectly possible for even highly sexed individuals to remain continent before marriage, without any abnormal psychological effects.

The belief that sexual continence in itself leads to nervous disorders is refuted by the experience of married people whose work or occupation keeps them for long periods away from their partner's society, *e g*, Arctic explorers and whalers, not to mention convicts. There is no evidence that continence, lasting sometimes for years, produces any neurotic symptoms in these men—indeed such men, while continent, are extraordinarily fit

It is true that if the sexual instinct is strongly and persistently aroused without finding satisfaction a condition of "morbid anxiety" sometimes occurs—as when a married couple with normal sex feelings sleep together, but for prudential or other reasons deny themselves sex relations. Under these conditions continence for many persons may be psychologically ill-advised. The abnormality in such a case results from the fact that the instinctive impulse is excessively stimulated without finding adequate outlet and expression. This state of morbid anxiety may obviously be prevented, as, for instance by (a) removing the embargo—giving full expression to love in normal sex relations, (b) removing the stimulus, *e g*., by the husband and wife occupying separate rooms, or (c) by adopting other means which will from the psychological point of view obviate the strain. In one or another of these ways the balance between the stimulus and expression may be restored.

in the case of the unmarried these conditions do not prevail, for normally there is not the same intimacy of relation, and therefore not the same strong and continuous arousal of the sex instinct. It is therefore quite consistent to demand complete continence before marriage, whilst ordinarily denying its advisability in married life.

A distressed state of mind similar to that of the "anxiety" state amongst the married may, however, arise amongst the unmarried if they continually subject themselves or are subjected to over stimulation of their sex instincts, whether from plays, books or amusements, or if they are without opportunity for sublimation of their normal sex instincts. If young men and women persistently indulge their sex phantasies they must expect to be the victims of acute moral and psychological distress. The arousal of these passions without satisfaction produces psychic tension, and the strain of keeping in check highly stimulated and pent-up feelings is similar to the strain of battle in which fear is continually aroused without finding an outlet. In both instances emotional excitement and morbid anxiety are liable to result.

But this result may be minimised by the avoidance of excessive stimulation of sexual desire, or by the provision of healthful opportunities for the maintenance of balance between stimulus and expression, the sexual instinct then assuming normal proportions.

The real harm, whether amongst the married or unmarried, comes, not from the restraint of normal sex desires, but from the frustration of a natural instinctive impulse artificially stimulated beyond the means of healthy control.

3 *Sexual Repression and Psycho-neuroses*

That "sexual repression" may sometimes cause psycho-neuroses (hysteria, obsessions, etc.) few psycho-therapists would deny. But it is not generally understood that the psycho-analyst uses "repression" in a purely technical sense, and that what he calls "repression" is not what the layman means in his use of that term, as synonymous with restraint. The psycho-analyst does not mean that psycho-neurosis occurs because an

adult restrains his fully-formed sex passions. What he says is that because of abnormal conditions in early childhood the sexual instincts have never fully developed into their adult form; that is to say, these instincts have not undergone normal development in early childhood, and therefore remain as "unconscious wishes" which persist and emerge later in one form or another of neurotic disorder.

What the psycho-analyst means when he says that psycho-neuroses are due to "sexual repression" is something very different from saying that they are due to sexual restraint. No responsible psycho-analyst would maintain that the suppression of his sexual impulses could produce a psycho-neurosis in an otherwise healthy person. The basis of the neurosis has been laid down in early childhood, as indicated above, and even the "repression" itself is a completely unconscious process—not a conscious process like that of the suppression of impulses such as anger, fear, or sex, of which we are completely aware, and which we necessarily restrain every day of our lives. The appeal which some make to the "New Psychology" in defence of incontinence is therefore without foundation, and is based on ignorance or misconception of what psychology really teaches.

There are some, it is true, more outside than inside the ranks of psycho-therapists, who advocate sexual relations as the most direct method of liberating these repressed instincts, but this view, far from being necessary to psycho-therapy, is discouraged not only by Freud, but also by the most prominent psycho-therapists of other schools of thought.

4. Celibacy and Nervous Disorders.

It may be true that unmarried people are more prone to "nervous" breakdown than married—whether this is actually the case we are not in a position to say. If it be so, it is certainly not due solely, as we have already explained, to the mere restraint of normal sex desires. Rather we should say that because the woman with strong normal sex instincts is more likely to get married than the one with "sexual repression," this leaves among the unmarried more of those with "sexual repression," and therefore prone to nervous disorders. It would not therefore

be surprising if we were to find more psycho-neuroses amongst the unmarried. There are, on the other hand, numbers of healthy unmarried women who have normal sex desires, but who have satisfactorily sublimated these and adopt a healthy attitude of mind towards life

This argument applies even more to men than to women. It is much truer to say in general that the man who remains celibate is unmarried because he is neurotic than that he is neurotic because he is unmarried, or has otherwise denied himself sex satisfaction.

5 *Temperamental Differences in Sex.*

There seems to be no doubt that people differ very considerably, physically, in the strength and vigour of their sexual instincts, this depending on physiological factors such as the activity of the endocrine glands, which play an important part in the psychological make-up of the individual. Some are less strongly endowed with sex feelings, whereas in others these feelings are very potent. There is little difficulty for persons of the first type, whether married or unmarried, to restrain themselves, whereas others may feel that some sexual expression is an imperative necessity, and to them continence entails considerable hardship. It is unjust that we should judge the latter without understanding their difference in temperament. The main problem of continence refers especially to these highly-sexed individuals, but for everybody it is a real problem, requiring instruction, guidance, and self-control.

For those with vigorous physical sexuality the hardship can be diminished, without resorting to promiscuity or any other form of incontinence, in two ways. *First*, by regarding the condition as temporary, for difficulties are much easier to bear when we realise that they will soon terminate. If men or women look forward to getting married, it will be much easier to remain chaste, they will restrain themselves in this as they do in their other passions and desires. *Secondly*, by the pursuit of activities, ideals, and ambitions which will serve both as an outlet for personal energies, and incidentally promote the earlier possibility of marriage.

We have confined ourselves in this statement to the psychological point of view, and have not dealt with the moral and social aspects, which nevertheless we regard as no less important

F. A. POWELL AVELING, Ph D , D.Sc., D.D.,
University Reader in Psychology,
King's College, London.

F. C. BARTLETT, M.A.,
Director of the Psychological
Laboratory, University of Cambridge

WILLIAM BROWN, M.A., M.D.,
Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy,
University of Oxford

J. A. HADFIELD, M.A , M.D.,
Lecturer on Psychology,
King's College, London.

MAURICE W. KEATINGE, M.A., D.Sc ,
Reader in Education in the
University of Oxford.

J. LEWIS MCINTYRE,
Anderson Lecturer in
Comparative Psychology,
University of Aberdeen

H. CRICHTON MILLER, M.A., M.D.,
Hon. Director, Tavistock Clinic
for Functional Nerve Cases.

A. W. P. WOLTERS, M.A.,
Lecturer in Education,
University College, Reading.

BRITISH SOCIAL HYGIENE COUNCIL, Inc.
(Late N.C.C.V.D.)

SOCIAL HYGIENE COMMITTEE.

Chairman

SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME, K C B., M D.

Members :

WILLIAM BROWN, Esq, M A, M D, D Sc.
PROFESSOR CYRIL BURT, M A, D Sc
MISS WINFRED CULLIS, O.B E, D Sc
DR. I FELDMAN
THE VERY REV. LIONEL FORD, Dean of York.
DAME KATHARINE FURSE D B E
MRS OGILVIE GORDON, D.Sc., Ph D., J P.
J A. HADFIELD, Esq, M A, M.D.
BERNARD HART, Esq, M D
PROFESSOR JULIAN HUXLEY, M A
M W KEATINGE, Esq, M A, D Sc.
DR C W KIMMINS
HUGH C KING, Esq
H. CRICHTON MILLER, Esq, M A, M D
PROFESSOR J H MUIRHEAD.
MISS ALISON NEILANS.
MISS UNA M SAUNDERS
PROFESSOR J. A THOMSON, M A., LL D
Z F. WILLIS, Esq.

Secretary General :

MRS C NEVILLE-ROLFE, O B.E.

Printed under the authority of His Majesty's STATIONERY OFFICE
By Harrison and Sons, Ltd, 44-47, St Martin's Lane, London, W C 1,
Printers in Ordinary to His Majesty